AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. III.—(XIII.)—AUGUST, 1895.—NO. 2.

THE OFFICE OF OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE.

IT may not be generally known that the Immaculate Virgin Mother of Christ has a special claim upon the devotion of American Catholics, under the title of "Our Lady of Guadalupe." Since 1847, the Church in the United States has celebrated the feast of the Immaculate Conception as the titular feast of this country. It has the rank of a *Duplex I^ae classis;* and, by a decree of the 30th of November, 1879, the privilege has been extended to the Universal Church. But, long before our Blessed Lady was venerated under this title as the special patron of America, she was recognized in the Liturgy of the early Spanish settlers and the Indian converts of the South, as the tutelary Saint of the New World. The Mexican Ordo emphasizes this fact by the manner in which it announces, for the 12th of December, "*Festum Apparitionis B. V. Mariae de Guadalupe, felicissimae nostrae Mexicanae Reipublicae totiusque Americae a Septentrione principalis Patronae.*" The Ordo of the diocese of Guadalaxara (1889) adds: *Gloria, honor et benedictio tam excelsae et augustae Patronae!* Dupl. I cl. cum Octava privilegiata.

The Mexicans, therefore, would seem to maintain that Our Lady of Guadalupe is the titulary of America, including North America; although we of the United States do not, at least in most of our dioceses, observe the rite proper to the feast. In reality, however, it will be found that, by a happy coincidence, the feast of the Immaculate Conception and that of the Apparition of Guadalupe are one, both in point of time, and in their liturgical significance. The miracle by which our blessed Lady appeared to a Mexican child on the soil of the New World, as she had so often done to the afflicted and innocent children of the old

Catholic lands in Europe, took place three times within the Octave of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception; which festival, as a revered friend from New Mexico states in a letter to the writer, was undoubtedly celebrated by the Spanish Franciscans at the time of the apparition—that is, as early as the year 1531.

For nearly two hundred years, the popular veneration of the wonderful image which recorded the appearance of our Blessed Lady to the young neophyte Juan Diego, (and in memory of which a magnificent sanctuary was erected on the hill of Tepeyac, near the city of Mexico,) kept alive the special devotion to our blessed Lady, under the title of Guadalupe. This title was dear to the hearts of the Spaniards on account of a celebrated shrine (Estramadura) in their own country, where, on the 17th of September, the pilgrims came together from all parts of Spain to honor a renowned picture of the Madonna, said to have been painted by the hand of St. Luke. Hence, we need not be surprised to find the devotion, enlivened by the miraculous occurrence in the New World, taken up by the Catholic lovers of our Lady in Spain, and France, and Italy, with a fervor hardly less ardent than that of the Catholics of South America.

By a decree, dated the 2d of July, 1757, Benedict XIV granted that the Feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe (Mexicana) might be celebrated in all the countries subject to the Spanish crown, on any day appointed by the Ordinary of the diocese. In the Kalendarium for the diocese of Pampeluna, we find it mentioned as a *duplex majus*, on the 15th of February. In the Kalendaria of Buenos Ayres (Argentine Rep.), and Montevideo (Uruguay), in South America, we find it celebrated on the 26th of February. In Rome, a special feast, under the title of "patrocinium B. M. V. de Guadalupe (Mexicana)," has long been celebrated in the church of St. Nicolas, *in Carcere Tulliano*. Here a copy of the Mexican Madonna is preserved which the exiled Jesuits took with them from their church in Mexico, in 1773, and which had been deposited in *S. Maria in Vineis* before it was given to the church of S. Nicolas.

Most of the Spanish and Italian churches celebrate the feast on the 12th of December as a *duplex majus.* This is the case in Madrid, where King Philip V erected a magnificent temple in honor of the Mexican Madonna; also at Toledo, Parma, Piacenza, Padua, Ferrara, Milan and other places.

This is the day also on which Our Blessed Lady of Guadalupe is honored as the local patron of Central America, California, the provinces of Columbia, Ecuador, and other parts of South America. The national Mexican Council of 1756 solemnly proclaimed Our Lady of Guadalupe *Patrona Principalis* of New Spain, and procured the erection of the magnificent sanctuary called *Hidalgo de Guadalupe.* In 1821 Iturbide, Emperor of Mexico, instituted a military Order in honor of Sancta Maria de Guadalupe, which was recognized and confirmed in 1852 by the President of the Mexican Republic. A decree of the Sacred Congregation (9th of July, 1805,) sanctions the celebration in the Mexican sanctuary of a solemn votive Mass in honor of S. M. de Guadalupe, on all Saturdays *non impedit. dupl. I cl.* Similar privileges are extended to other sanctuaries of the same name.

It is also noteworthy that the discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus, on the 4th of November, 1593, dedicated one of the Lesser Antilles in the West Indies to this title, by calling it the Island of Guadalupe.

It is quite fitting, therefore, that Our Lady of Guadalupe should be called, by excellence, *Our Lady of America.* And so she is regarded by many who come under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Council of Baltimore, and for whom the feast of the Immaculate Conception is the prime titulary feast. Thus, the diocese of Santa Fé enjoys the privilege of celebrating the feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe on the 12th of December, *sub ritu dupl. I cl.*; and the clergy have a special Office for this day, taken from the proprium of the Mexican Church and approved by a recent Decree of Leo XIII, who, not long ago, showed his special veneration for the Madonna of Guadalupe by sending a golden crown to her sanctuary in Mexico.

The liturgical Office for the feast, as given in the Mexican Breviary, is extremely beautiful, and the fear of marring the quaint and rich simplicity of the original form would be a sufficient apology for not attempting any translation, even if we were not conscious of writing for those who can enjoy the Latin text.

The antiphons at Vespers and Lauds, as well as the Little Chapters, have reference to the apparition vouchsafed to the neophyte Juan Diego, which is related in the lessons of the second Nocturn. The antiphons point out the blessing of Mary's special patronage over this country: "*Flores apparuerunt in terra nostra*: te laudamus sancta Dei Genetrix;" or again, "Tu gloria Jerusalem, tu laetitia Israel, *tu honorificatio populi tui*," and, "Cantate ei canticum novum: *annuntiate inter gentes gloriam ejus.*" So also the Antiphon of the Magnificat: "Elegi et sanctificavi locum istum, ut sit ibi nomen meum, et permaneant oculi mei et cor meum ibi cunctis diebus." The Versicle and Response to this are: "Non fecit taliter omni nationi" etc.

The hymn for Matins is from the Office of the Immaculate Conception, "Praeclara Custos Virginum," as we should expect. The hymn for Lauds, however, is not found in the Roman Breviary. It is the composition of St. Anselm of Canterbury. We give it in full:

Alma, Parens, omni carens
Corruptelae macula,
Quam elegit qui confregit
Dirae mortis vincula,

Clemens! praesta ut qui festa
Tua gaudent colere,
Gratulentur et laetentur,
Verae lucis lumine.

Egenorum et vinctorum
Consolare gemitum:
Fave votis, dans aegrotis
Optatum remedium.

Pax et quies nostros dies
Faciant laetissimos:
Inimicos fac amicos,
Seda malos homines.

Primum quidem nobis fidem
Tuis auge precibus,
Spe labentes firma mentes,
Charitate robora.

Mater Dei! nostrae spei
Causa et exordium,
Aufer bella et flagella,
Famem, pestem, gladium.

O Maria, Mater Pia,
Tuum da subsidium,
Ut regnemus et laudemus
Tuum semper Filium.

Pater Deus, Fili Deus,
Deus Alme Spiritus,
Per aeterna nos guberna
Saecula, Deus Trinitas. Amen.

The Lessons of the first Nocturn are from the Book of Ecclesiasticus (cap. xxiv): "Ego ex ore Altissimi," and beautifully describe the charms and prerogatives of our blessed Lady, in terms applied to the divine wisdom. They, like the remaining Nocturns, are introduced by antiphons (pointing the triplets of psalms) indicative of our Lady's vocation and desire to bring salvation to the children of this strange land. "Signum magnum apparuit in coelo," etc., "Populus qui ambulabat in tenebris vidit lucem magnam; habitantibus in regione umbrae mortis, lux orta est." Then follows the story of the apparition, in the second Nocturn, which ends with the responsory:

"Elegi et sanctificavi locum istum, ut sit ibi nomen meum, et permaneant oculi mei et cor meum."

Anno a reparata salute millesimo quingentesimo trigesimo primo, Deipara Virgo Joanni Didaco, pio rudique neophyto, Mexici in colle Tepejacensi, uti antiqua et constanti traditione mandatur, sese videndam praebuit, eumque peramanter alloquens, Episcopum adire, ipsique aedem inibi sibi sacram excitandam nuntiare jussit. Rei veritatem solerter exploraturus, responsionem distulit Joannes de Zumarraga, loci Antistes: ac neophyto, Beatissimae Virginis adspectu imperioque rursus permoto, legationemque lacrymis et precibus iteranti, praecepit ut signum, quo magnae Dei matris ostenderetur voluntas, enixe peteret.

Dum viam a colle Tepejacensi remotiorem neophytus arriperet, et Mexicum, ne patruo lethali morbo correpto extrema deessent sacramenta, Sacerdotem advocaturus contenderet, eidem benignissima Virgo tertio occurrit; moerentem de patrui sanitate certiorem facit, rosasque pulcherrimas, contra loci hyemisque asperitatem, recens obortas, in ejus pallio compositas, Episcopo deferri injungit. Mandatis obsequitur Didacus, cujus in pallio, rosis coram Episcopo effusis, Mariae sanctae imago, qua prorsus specie in colle prope urbem sese exhibuerat, mirum in modum depicta conspicitur. Tanto perculsi prodigio religiosam cives effigiem in Episcopali sacello rite asservandam curant: quae, paulo post, solemni pompa ad aedem in colle Tepejacensi extructam translata, insigni gentium cunctarum veneratione praefulget.

R. Quae est ista, quae progreditur quasi aurora consurgens: *Pulchra ut luna, electa ut sol?

V. Quasi arcus refulgens inter nebulas gloriae, et quasi flos rosarum in diebus vernis.—Pulchra ut luna.

Magnifico deinceps excepta templo, cui Canonicorum Collegium Romani Pontifices ad divini cultus splendorem addiderunt, Mexicanae gentis pietatem in Deiparam summopere adauxit, ingentique colitur populorum ac miraculorum frequentia. Quapropter Eam uti praesentissimum adversus publicas privatasque calamitates praesidium Archiepiscopus Mexicanus ceterique illarum regionum Antistites, omnium ordinum consensione, in

primariam adlegerunt universae Mexicanae Nationis Patronam, riteque electam Benedictus decimus quartus auctoritate apostolica declaravit, atque Officium et Missam sub titulo Beatae Virginis Guadalupensis recitari concessit. Leo vero decimus tertius iteratis Mexicanorum Praesulum petitionibus benigne annuens, novissimum hoc Officium, ex Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis consulto, recitari indulsit, Virginisque Effigiem prodigiis atque cultu celebrem aurea corona, suo nomine et jussu, solemni ritu condecorari decrevit.

The Homily of the third Nocturn is St. Bernard's colloquy (De Verbis Apoc., cap. xii), on that charming description by which St. Luke introduces the "Magnificat."

The antiphon of the "Benedictus" deserves mention as characteristic and suggestive of Indian imagery: "Quasi arcus refulgens inter nebulas gloriae, et quasi flos rosarum in diebus vernis."

This may suffice to direct attention to a hallowed region of our Western Continent which is full of sacred traditions and rich in graces that must have largely contributed to strengthen the faith and zeal of those early missionaries to whom we owe much more than, perchance, we suspect.

THE EDITOR.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

THE Christian idea of inspiration does not necessarily imply an immediate revelation of the truths and facts recorded by the inspired writers. They may have known a great deal of their material by natural means, and received from God only the supernatural judgment concerning the verity of their natural acquirements. That this was the case with the evangelists, we may infer from the introduction to the third gospel, where St. Luke testifies that he writes after "having diligently attained to all things from the beginning."[1] But where there is question of a work of research, as it were, we are naturally curious to learn the sources from which the author has drawn his information. And if several authors happen to agree to a great extent in material and language, we necessarily infer that they have used the same

1 Luke i. 3.

sources, more or less servilely according to the measure of their mutual agreement. Now the agreement in matter and language of the first three, or the Synoptic, gospels is so striking that no Scripture student, unless he admit the generally abandoned theory of verbal inspiration, can escape the question concerning the sources of the three evangelists. If we had to account for the mutual agreement of the gospels only, our task would be an easy one : we should find without much difficulty in Christian antiquity either oral or written sources that might have been employed successively by St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke, or perhaps we should be able to show that the second evangelist drew from the first, and the third from both the first and second. In point of fact, the Synoptic Gospels have, besides their numerous agreements in matter and language, most important discrepancies, and it is owing to these especially that our question has become an entangled one. It has been treated so universally during the course of the present century, and is still investigated with such persistent ardor, that a survey of its nature, its attempted solutions, and a statement of what appears to the writer to be the true solution of the difficulty, must prove both interesting and useful : interesting, because all these points are intimately connected with the most important literature of Christianity ; useful, because an insight into the genesis of the gospels will throw new light on their meaning, thus assisting both the apologist and the commentator. We shall then in this paper first state the Synoptic Problem ; secondly, give a table of theories attempting to solve it ; thirdly, add the true solution of the problem and apply it to the various phenomena involved in the case.

I.—STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.

The statement of the problem involves the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the Synoptic Gospels. In the quantitative analysis we shall have to consider the agreements and discrepancies of the Synoptic Gospels in their general outline, in their detail, and in their verbal expression ; the qualitative analysis necessitates first a general view

of the component elements, and secondly a closer description of the same.

A.—QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS.

a.—Agreement and Disagreement in General.

Periods of the life of Jesus.	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Mk. Mt.	Mk. Lk.	Mt. Lk.	Remarks.
I.—History of the Infancy.	i. ii.		i. ii. iii. 23-38.				Disagree.
II.—The Baptist, baptism, temptation, beginning of public life.	iii. i.-iv. 22.	i. 1-20	iii. 1-22; iv. 1-30.				At the end Lk. disagrees
III.—Till Herod hears of Jesus.	iv.23-xiii. 58.	i. 21-vi.13	iv. 31.-ix. 6.	Mk.iii.20-30; vi.1-6.	Mk. i. 21. ff.; 33ff. Lk. iv. 31. ff.; 41ff.	Mt. viii. 5. ff., xi. Lk. vii. 1ff.; 18ff. etc.	Mt. follows his own order.
IV. — Till Jesus journeys to Jerusalem.	xiv.-xvii.	vi. 14-ix. 50.	ix. 7-50.	Mk.vi.45-viii. 26; Mt. xiv. 22-xvi. 12.			Common order.
V. — Jesus journeys to Jerusalem			ix. 51-xviii. 14.				Parallel passages not wholly wanting.
VI.—Ministry in Perea and Judea.	xix. xx.	x.	xviii. 15-xix. 27.	Mt. xix. 1ff: xx. 20ff.			Common order.
VII.— Last days before the Passion.	xxi.-xxv.	xi.-xiii.	xix. 28-xxi.	Mt. xxii. 34ff.	Lk. xxi. 1ff.		Common order.
VIII —History of the Passion.	xxvi. xxvii.	xiv. xv.	xxii. xxiii	The anointing of the body of Jesus.			Agree in principal points.
IX.—History of the Resurrection.	xxviii.	xvi.	xxiv.				Agree in the beginning.
N. B. Peculiar to	ix. 27-38; xvii. 24-27; almost the whole of xviii.; xxi. 8f.; almost the entire discourse of xxiii. and xxiv., the death of Judas; the guard of the sepulchre.	vii. 31-37; viii. 21-26.	v. 1ff; vii. 1ff.; vii. 35ff., ix. 51-xviii. 14; xix. 1-27.		Mk. iii. 20off is parallel to Lk., but differently connected.	Mt. viii. 9ff.; xi. 20ff.; xii. 22ff.; are parallel to Lk., but differently connected.	Scattered parallel sentences have not been considered.

b.—Agreement and Disagreement in Detail.

1. If we divide the Synoptic Gospels into 554 parts, as it is done in the works of Eusebius, we find that 182 of them are common to all three Synoptists; 73 are common to Matthew and Mark; 104 to Matthew and Luke; 14 to Mark and Luke; 69 are peculiar to Matthew; 93 to Luke; 20 to Mark; so that all the parts which enter into the first gospel amount to 427, those of the second gospel to 392, and those of the third to 289. The fourth gospel has not been considered in this division.[1]

2. If we follow the division into 150 parts, employed in the Evangelaria of the middle ages, we find that 65 are common to Matthew, Mark and Luke; 15 to Mark and Matthew; 5 to Mark and Luke; 12 to Matthew and Luke; 14 are peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark, 37 to Luke. In all, therefore, 97 of the 150 parts are common to three or two evangelists, while 53 are peculiar to one of them.

3. It may not be uninteresting to give the proportions of common to peculiar matter of the Synoptists, according to our present verse-division. The first gospel contains 1072 verses, the second 677, the third 1152; of these 330–370 are common to the three gospels, 170–180 are common to Mark and Matthew, 50 to Mark and Luke, 230–240 to Matthew and Luke, while 330 are peculiar to Matthew, 68 to Mark, 541 to Luke. The circumstance that the same amount of matter is divided up into a different number of verses in the different Synoptic Gospels, renders it impossible to give the number of the common verses in exact figures.

4. Reuss has divided the Synoptic Gospels into 124 parts, following the natural grouping of the subject matter; 47 of these are common to the three Synoptists, 12 to Mark and Matthew, 6 to Mark and Luke, 2 to Luke and Matthew, 17 are peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark, 38 to Luke. According to this division, Luke embraces 93 parts of the 124, Matthew 78, Mark only 67. This shows that we obtain different results concerning the contents of the gospels according to the difference of analysis applied to them.

1 Cf. Euseb. ep. ad. Carp. in Migne, 22, 1276, ff.

5. If we divide each of the Synoptic Gospels into 100 parts, we obtain the following results: Matthew has 58 parts common with the others or another, and 42 peculiar to himself; Mark has 93 common and 7 peculiar,[1] Luke has 41 common and 59 peculiar. This analysis shows the nature of the different gospels better than any of the preceding lists.

6. Finally, we may divide all the common matter into 100 parts: 53 of these parts will be found common to the three Synoptists, 21 to Matthew and Luke, 20 to Matthew and Mark, 6 to Mark and Luke.

c.—Verbal agreement and disagreement.

1. It has been observed that of the 58 per cent. of the first gospel, common to one or more of the Synoptists, 16 are verbal agreements; of the 93 per cent. of the second gospel that are common, also 16 consist in verbal agreements; of the 41 per cent. of the third gospel that agree with one or more Synoptists, 10 are verbal agreements. It follows from this that we may establish the following proportion: Real agreement : verbal agreement : : 58 : 16 (in Matthew), 93 : 16 (in Mark), 41 : 10 (in Luke), or, if we reduce the fractions to the common denominator 7, which is practically, though not mathematically, accurate, the real agreements: verbal agreements : : 24 : 7 (in Matthew), 40 : 7 (in Mark), 28 : 7 (in Luke).

2. Of the foregoing 16 per cent. of verbal agreements in the first gospel 14 are found in recitative parts, and 2 in narrative; of the 16 per cent. of verbal agreements in the second gospel, 13 are found in recitative passages, and only 3 in narrative; of the 10 per cent. of verbal agreements found in the third gospel, 9 are found in recitative parts, and 1 in narrative. On the other hand, 25 per cent. of the first gospel is narrative, 75 per cent. recitative; 50 per cent. of the second gospel is narrative and 50 per cent. recitative; 34.5 per cent. of the third gospel is narrative and 65.5 per cent. is recitative; combining these facts with the foregoing, we obtain the following results:

1 The inverse ratio obtains in the fourth gospel which has 92 per cent. peculiar, and 8 per cent. common.

	Narrative.		Recitative.	
	Common matter.	Proper matter.	Common matter.	Proper matter.
Matthew,	2 per cent.	23 per cent.	15 per cent.	60 per cent.
Mark,	3 "	47 "	13 "	37 "
Luke,	0.5 "	34 "	9.5 "	25 "
	Verbal agreem.	Verbal disagr.	Verbal agreem.	Verbal disagr.

B.—QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS.

Here we shall, *a.*, give a table illustrating the qualitative agreement and disagreement of the Synoptic Gospels; *b.*, we shall describe the various elements composing the gospels, as far as such a description is needed to understand the difficulties of the problem.

a.—Table illustrating the Qualitative Analysis.

In the table we shall distinguish the various elements thus: All printed in common type, is peculiar to one of the evangelists; all printed in capitals, is common to the three Synoptists; all in spaced type, is common to Mark and Matthew; all that is underlined, is common to Mark and Luke; all that is overlined, is common to Matthew and Luke. For the accommodation of all readers, we shall follow the English text; the scientific reader will find the Greek text thus analyzed in Rushbrooke's Synopticon.

Matthew xxi.	Mark xii.	Luke xx.
33. Hear ye another PARABLE: There was A MAN an householder who PLANTED A VINEYARD, and made a hedge round about it, and dug in it a press, and built a tower AND LET IT out TO HUSBANDMEN, and went into a strange country:	1. And he began to speak to them in PARABLES: A certain MAN PLANTED A VINEYARD, and made a hedge about it, and dug a place for the wine vat, and built a tower, AND LET IT TO HUSBANDMEN, and went into a far country.	9. And he began to speak to the people this PARABLE. A certain MAN PLANTED A VINEYARD AND LET IT out TO HUSBANDMEN, and he was abroad for a long time.
34. AND when the time of the fruits drew nigh HE SENT his SERVANTS TO THE HUSBANDMEN that they might receive the FRUITS thereof.	2. AND at the season, HE SENT TO THE HUSBANDMEN a SERVANT to receive of the husbandmen of the FRUIT of the FRUIT of the vineyard.	10. AND at the season HE SENT a SERVANT TO THE HUSBANDMEN that they should give him of the FRUIT of the vineyard.

b.—Description of the Elements.

1. For convenience sake, the parts common to the three Synoptists have been called the triple tradition, while the parts common to only two of the evangelists are designated as double tradition. But we must guard here against a double misunderstanding. The triple tradition does not mean a triply attested tradition; for as we infer from the verbal agreement of two reports of an event, their common origin and their foundation on a single authority, so we rightly conclude from the triple tradition of an event in the gospels its ultimate foundation on a single witness, single either physically or, at least, morally. The second misunderstanding against which we have to guard, refers to the mutual relations of the triple and the double and the single tradition; as we should be wrong were we to infer the existence of three or more moons from the variety of ways in which the terrestrial side of the moon is illumined, so we might be wrong in assuming the existence of two or more fundamental traditions, singly attested, on account of reading some parts of the doctrine and the life of Jesus in two evangelists, others in three.

2. The triple tradition begins with the ministry of the Baptist, and ends after the resurrection. It is not, however, equally striking throughout; in the history of the passion and the resurrection, in those parts generally that must have been most commonly repeated, the agreement of the gospels decreases. The substance of the different records remains the same, but the verbal expression varies considerably.

3. On the whole, we may call the double tradition of Mark and Matthew a function of the double tradition of Mark and Luke. For even a cursory reading of Rushbrooke's Synopticon shows one that hardly anything is left of Mark after Matthew and Luke are subtracted; moreover, these two evangelists seem to make it a point to divide between them the double expressions for which Mark is noted, a characteristic that has been called his dualism. Mark i, 32, *e. g.*, reads: "and when it was evening after sunset"; the parallel

passage in Matthew[1] borrows only the first half of Mark's expression "and when evening was come," while Luke[2] borrows the second half of Mark "and when the sun was down."

4. These being the principal elements that constitute the Synoptic Problem, we shall now proceed to give a summary of the attempted solutions. Neither all the minutiae of the various systems nor all their several defenders can be enumerated; but in all cases the description will be sufficiently minute to warrant us in rejecting the solution.

II.—ATTEMPTED SOLUTIONS.

A.—Theory of Mutual Dependence.

According to this theory all the foregoing agreements and disagreements of the Synoptic Gospels must be explained by the fact that the second evangelist made use of the first, and the third of both second and first; its varieties are specified by the place assigned to each gospel in this chain of dependency.

a. Luke, Mark, Matthew is the order advocated by Vogel[3].

b. Luke, Matthew, Mark is the series of dependence established by Beza, Büsching,[4] Evanson,[5] Thiersch,[6] Gfrörer.[7]

c. Mark, Luke, Matthew is the order assumed by Storr,[8] Wilke, B. Bauer, Volkmar,[9] Pfleiderer.

d. Mark, Matthew, Luke is the series of dependency defended by Ritschl;[10] the writer distinguishes the primitive, written source from our second gospel, without maintaining any difference between them.

1 viii, 16. 2 iv, 40.

3 Gabler's Journal für auserlesene Theolog. Literatur, i, 1, ff; cf. Schneckenburger, Beiträge, p. 16.

4 Die vier Evv., Hamb. 1776. 5 1792

6 Hist. Standpunkt, 182 7 1838

8 De fonte evv. Matth. et Luc., Tüb. 1794; Zweck der ev. Gesch. des Joh., 58 ff.

9 These three authors find, however, interpolations in the derived gospels.

10 Theologische Jahrbücher, 1851.

e. Matthew, Luke, Mark is an order of dependence that has found many adherents on account of its external and internal grounds of probability. Among its Catholic advocates are Kuhn, Schwarz,[1] A. Maier,[2] Langen,[3] Döllinger,[4] J. Grimm,[5] K. Nippel;[6] among its other defenders may be mentioned Griesbach,[7] Saunier, Theile, Sieffert, Ammon, Fritzsche, Gfrörer, de Wette, Bleek, Delitzsch, Keim; to these must be added the representatives of the Tübingen School, Schwegler, Baur, Köstlin, Zeller, Strauss, though they follow this order of dependency on grounds peculiar to their dogmatic position. The value of their arguments does not exceed that of an "a priori" constructed history of the early Church, and they have been so often refuted that a new attack on them would be slaying the slain. Neither are the above mentioned external and internal grounds on which both Catholics and Protestants defend this theory above exception. We shall see that the dualism of Mark i, 32, 42; ii, 13; v, 2; vi, 14; viii, 27; x, 46, can be explained more naturally than by making the evangelist a mechanical combiner of Matthew and Luke; and the words of Clement of Alexandria,[8] concerning the prior origin of the gospels containing genealogies, may be fully correct without implying that the gospel containing no genealogy depends on the former.

f. Matthew, Mark, Luke may be called the traditional theory of dependency. It may be traced from the times of St. Augustin[9] down to our own days: Victor of Antioch,[10] Bede,[11] Euthymius, Theophylactus, Nic. of Lyra, Erasmus, a Lapide, Maldonatus, Jansenius, Hug,[12] Patrizi, Danko, Coleridge, Reithmayr, Valroger, Bacuez, Schanz.[13] The

1 Tübingen 1844; Kirchenlex., Art. Evang., iii, 779, 801.
2 Freib. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1849, p. 70 ff; Einleit. 1852, p. 36 ff.
3 Einleit, p. 60. 4 Christenthum und Kirche, 1860, p. 133.
5 Einleit, p. 507. 6 Theol. Quartalsch., 1876, pp. 551, 579.
7 Commentatio, 1789, 1790. 8 Eus. VI, xiv, 5.
9 De consensu Evang. i, 2. 10 Cramer, Cat. i.
11 Praef. ad Luc, ep. resp. ad Accam. 12 Einleit, ii, p. 25 ff.
13 Evang. des h. Mark, Einleit, p. 24 ff.

latter writers have, however, modified this system somewhat. Schanz, *e. g.*, admits the use of oral tradition besides the gospels; Patrizi believes that Mark depends on the Aramaic Matthew, while the Greek Matthew made use of our Mark. Among the Protestant patrons of this theory may be noted Carlstadt, Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Townson. The names of Hilgenfeld, Eichthal, Holsten and Simons which are sometimes classed under this category, belong rather to the theory of mixed dependence.

In general, the theory of mutual dependence accounts only for the agreements of the gospels; it does not explain either the pure additions in each of the synoptic writers, or the omissions, or, again, the discrepancies in parallel passages. The additions in each gospel must certainly be referred to a source different from the inspired writings, and, therefore, the system of mutual dependence cannot be defended in such a manner as to exclude all other sources. The omissions in the different gospels regard matter that would have admirably served the scope of the several writers. Why should St. Mark, *e. g.*, omit the cure of the centurion's servant,[1] or the exorcism of the blind and dumb devil,[2] or the resuscitation of the widow's son at Naim,[3] if either the first or the third gospel was known to him? Since the second gospel represents Jesus as the great thaumaturgus, the foregoing miracles would have been in keeping with the character of the writing. And similarly, there is no good reason why the first evangelist, the recorder of our Lord's words, should have omitted the parables of the seed growing secretly,[4] the two debtors,[5] the Pharisee and the publican,[6] the rich man and Lazarus,[7] if he had known the Gospel of Mark or Luke. Finally, Matthew, xi. 28 and Mark, ii. 27, to limit ourselves to only a few particulars, would have well agreed with the scope and aim of St. Luke; why then are these passages omitted, if the third evangelist knew the work of either the first

1 Matthew, viii, 5. 2 Matthew, xii 22. 3 Luke, vii, 11.
4 Mark, iv. 5 Mark, xii. 6 Luke, xviii.
7 Luke, xvi.

or the second? The insufficiency of the mutual dependence theory is still further proved, if we pay attention to the discrepancy of the three evangelists in parallel passages. Why should the first and third evangelists have omitted all the minute details and particulars found in the second gospel? Why should the third evangelist especially prefer to tell in Aramaic idioms, Greek scholar though he was, what he read in the other gospels in pure Greek?[1] We cannot here draw attention to all that speaks against the mutual dependence theory; but what has been said, sufficiently shows its inadequacy to solve the Synoptic Problem.

B.—Theory of Written Sources.

By the theory of written sources we understand the endeavor to account for the agreements and discrepancies of the Synoptic Gospels by the assumption that the writers had one or more writings before them, and copied them or combined them in such a manner as to produce our present Synoptic Gospels. It is understood that the written sources here in question must be distinct from our Canonical Gospels. The following are the principal phases under which this theory has made its appearance.

a. The theory of fragments was advocated by Schleiermacher in its pure form,[2] and in a simpler form by E. Sartorius.[3] Here may also be mentioned Köstlin's Samaritan source for our Lord's Samaritan ministry, Kuinoel's gnomology for Luke ix, 57–xviii, 14; Keim's Paulinian source for Luke's account of the Holy Eucharist, Volkmar's Essenian source for our Lord's sayings concerning the abnegation of self. Even were we to grant the existence of these sources, which is gratuitously assumed, we might as well expect to

1 Cf. Luke, v. 1 and Matthew, iv. 18; Luke, viii. 22 and Matthew, viii. 18; Luke, xx. 11 and Matthew, xxi, 36 and Mark, xii. 4; Luke, iii. 20; v. 1. 12. 17; vii. 11. 12. 28; viii. 1. 22. 40; ix. 18. 33. 27; ix. 51. 57; x. 38; xi. 1. 14; xiii. 11; xiv. 1; xvii. 11; xviii. 6. 35; xix. 2. 15; xix, 29; xx. 1. 11. 12; xxiv. 4. 5. 15. 30. 51.

2 Über die Schriften des Lucas, B. 1817.

3 Über die Entstehung der drei ersten Evv., 1820.

build up a beautiful statue out of the chips in a granite quarry as construct our Synoptic Gospels out of the chance fragments of the early ecclesiastical writers. The inconveniences which this theory has in common with other forms of written sources, will be found below.

b. One written source. Of the various ways in which this theory has been proposed we may mention Lessing's[1] endeavor to explain all by a recourse to the gospel according to the Hebrews, and Eichhorn's attempt[2] to solve the question by assuming a Primitive Gospel containing a summary of Jesus' ministry, or again Bleek and de Wette's view concerning the Galilean source of the first and third gospel, which have been abbreviated by the second evangelist. Since these various forms have been abandoned, we need not develop them any further.

c. Several written sources. This theory has been presented under two principal forms: 1. The sources are Proto-Matthew and Proto-Mark; 2. they are Proto-Matthew and two Proto-Marks.

1. It was in 1832 that Schleiermacher inferred from the testimony of Papias concerning our first and second gospel the existence of a Proto-Matthew and a Proto-Mark. For Papias[3] testifies that "Matthew composed the oracles [the logia] in Hebrew." Since our first gospel contains not only the sayings of Jesus, but also His deeds, Papias cannot, according to Schleiermacher, refer to it; therefore, St. Matthew must have written a work containing the oracles or sayings of Jesus. Again, from the testimony of Papias[4] that St. Mark as the secretary of St. Peter, wrote what he remembered of his master's instructions concerning the deeds and sayings of Christ, but "not in order," Schleiermacher inferred that St. Mark composed a work distinct from our second gospel, since the latter is written in order. We may remark here that the learned author reasoned badly in both cases. As to the case of Matthew, "logia" is taken in the sense of "gospel" by

1 1784. 2 1804. 3 Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39.
4 Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39.

Eusebius, as is clear from the context; it is employed by Papias in the sense of "sayings and doings," as we see from the title of his work,[1] and from the context of the passage in question;[2] in Romans iii, 2, the word refers to the whole Old Testament, in Hebrews v, 12, to the whole body of Christ's teaching, in Flavius Josephus[3] to Holy Writ, in Irenaeus[4] to the gospel. And combining with these facts the complete silence of antiquity concerning any Proto-Matthew containing only the "oracles" of Jesus, we may safely follow the lead of universal Christian tradition which has identified the λόγια mentioned by Papias with our first gospel.[5] In the case of St. Mark, we might show that there are different kinds of order, and that though the second gospel follows the chronological order, it may well be said not to be written in the topological order observed in the first gospel, or in the dramatic order followed by St. John; Christian tradition is here too a safer guide than the hypothesis of Schleiermacher. We have thought it proper to say a few words concerning the foundation of the Proto-Matthew and Proto-Mark hypothesis on account of its intimate connection with many of the following systems.

A few years after Schleiermacher's reputed discovery, Credner[6] applied the Proto-Matthew and Proto-Mark to the solution of the Synoptic Problem; according to him the former is the source of the discourses in the three gospels, the latter is the basis of their narrative portions. Holtzmann[7] regarded the Proto-Mark as the source of the double tradition of Matthew and Luke, while the Proto-Matthew served as the source for Luke ix, 51–xviii, 14; but we shall see that this learned writer has modified his view. Weiz-

1 The title reads Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, though the treatise is not confined to the consideration of mere sayings.

2 Speaking of St. Mark's work, Papias considers the term λόγια as parallel to "doings and sayings."

3 Bell. Jud. IV, v. 4.

4 Cont. Haer. procem.

5 Cf. Hilgenfeld, Einleit., p. 456; Lightfoot, Contempor. Review, 1867, pp. 405 ff.; 1875, August, pp. 395 ff.

6 1836. 7 1863.

säcker[1] believes that Proto-Matthew is the source of the five great discourses found in the first gospel: Matthew v. vii; x; xiii; xviii; xxiv–xxv. According to this opinion the third evangelist would have had to dismember our Lord's discourses and set their parts into fitting incidents.

2. The second form under which the theory of several written sources is proposed, admits a Proto-Matthew and two Proto-Marks. Beyschlag[2] is the originator of this opinion; the first Proto-Mark contains the preaching of St. Peter, the second is an orderly edition of the first, and forms, together with Proto-Matthew, the common source of the Synoptic Gospels.

The hypothesis of written sources is as little sufficient to solve the Synoptic Problem as the theory of mutual dependence. The agreements indeed of the three gospels may be thus explained; but how account for their variations? Are they nothing but the product of the writers' imagination? Or if this be not the case, whence did the evangelists draw them? And again, either the entire matter of the Synoptic Gospels was contained in the written documents, or it was not; if all the matter was contained therein, the same difficulty arises here that met us above, regarding the omission of available and suitable material by each evangelist. If the entire material of the Synoptists was not contained in the written sources, they are insufficient to account for the present condition of our first three gospels.

C.—Theory of Mixed Sources.

We understand by mixed sources the combined theories of mutual dependence and of written sources. The authors defending this combination theory may be classified differently from different points of view.

a. If we divide them according to their opinion on the Proto-Mark, we have on the one side Reuss, Scholten, Weizsäcker, B. Brücker, who think that Proto-Mark is less comprehensive than our second gospel; and on the other

1 1864. 2 1881.

side Ewald, Schenkel, Wittichen, Weisse, Weiffenbach, Tobler, Holtzmann, Sevin, Mangold, who believe that Proto-Mark is more comprehensive than our canonical Mark.

b. Classifying the defenders of the mixed sources according to the order in which our Synoptic Gospels have been written, we find that practically all agree in assigning to Mark the first place; Weisse gives Luke the second, while Reuss, Ewald, Meyer, Thiersch, Hausrath, Schenkel, Scholten, Wittichen, H. Wendt, E. Simons, Jacobsen place Matthew immediately after Mark, and Luke after both.

c. Viewing the foregoing authors according to the manner in which the second and the third Synoptic Gospel depend on the first and on the Proto-Gospels, we perceive that in the opinion of most writers Matthew and Luke are independent of each other, and directly dependent on the stated sources; but according to B. Brückner, Jacobsen, Wittichen, Scholten, Meyer, the third gospel depends both on the first two gospels and on the other sources. We have seen above in the mutual dependence theory, that Pfleiderer admits a similar dependence of Matthew on both Mark and Luke, and that Ritschl admits the double dependence of Luke on both Mark and Matthew.

Notwithstanding the learning and ability shown by the foregoing authors in their treatment of the Synoptic Problem, we do not think that they have fully answered the question or explained its phenomena. It would be hard for a Catholic theologian to admit that an evangelist should be inspired by the Holy Ghost to place his inspired and his uninspired sources on the same level, so as to prefer now the report of the one source, now of the other. Again, the theory of mixed sources proceeds on the assumption that the evangelists composed their works as an historian of our time writes his history; a simple perusal of the Synoptic Gospels suffices to convince us of their primitive and unscientific manner of composition. Besides, the theory implies a literary labor that is hardly compatible with the Apostolic age and with the simplicity of the Synoptists. Finally, we need not urge again the difficulty of accounting in this manner for the variations of the

Synoptic Gospels and for the dualism which admittedly exists in the gospel of Mark. That Mark should have accidentally, and by way of mere literary amplification, chosen to combine two expressions which exist separately in the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke, and done this at least seven times in his short gospel[1] is more than the calculus of probabilities will admit. Why have we not, at least, analogous phenomena in the first and third gospel?

In the next number we shall give what we deem the true solution of the Synoptic Problem.

(*To be continued.*)

A. J. MAAS, S.J.

Woodstock College, Md.

THE MIND OF THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE.

THE utterances of men in high judicial authority in any large community are important factors in shaping public life. They unify the actions of the well-disposed; they determine the position of others who are passive, yet whose inert weight counts for something on whatever side they fall; and they often bring to light hostile influences which, disguised by secrecy, become all the more dangerous to society on that account. Unfortunately the true sense of spoken words suffers, at times, in the transmission through those multiplied channels of the public press whose guardians have, like other men, their prejudices, and whose profession tempts them occasionally to follow these in their presentation of facts. It is gratifying, therefore, to be able to read the utterances of such an authority as the Apostolic Delegate, in a volume published with his own sanction.[1]

The book is well named "Loyalty to Church and State," for religion and loyal citizenship, and their common bond,

1 "Loyalty to Church and State. The mind of His Excellency, Francis Archbishop Satolli, Apostolic Delegate." Edited by the Very Rev. J. R. Slattery, for the benefit of St. Joseph's Seminary and Epiphany Apostolic College for training missionaries to the colored people. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1895.

education, are foundation stones of that liberty which is the watchword of Americans and their proudest boast.

The Apostolic Delegate makes clear the two prevailing dangers which threaten our much favored country from the adoption of false principles in philosophy. The one regards the functions of education; the other, the position of the Church toward the State.

Speaking before the authorities of the public school and the mayor of Waterbury, Conn., he points out the true office of the educator, which is to train not only the intellect but the heart of the youth, "not only that he may know nature, and provide what is useful and necessary for life, but also that he may live as an honest, upright citizen, possessing all the moral virtues that should adorn a man. As the gymnasium is necessary to develop the physical man, so it is needful to practice religion in order to strengthen and nourish the soul, and to make the man just and charitable. This moral education, so necessary, must be animated by the divine spirit." Clear and pregnant of truth as these words are, the Apostolic Delegate does not go out of his way to censure the well meant efforts of those who seek to educate the mind in preference to the heart; rather, with characteristic delicacy, he points out how the higher aim of training also the heart is not excluded by the terms of the American Constitution. "To say that the Constitution of the United States forbids the civil power to frame laws about religion, or to become involved in matters strictly pertaining to religion, is one thing. But it is altogether different to hold that the American Constitution is godless, or that the American life requires not the influence of religion. For it is consonant with the spirit of true liberty and well ordered government, so to educate youth and so to enlighten their minds that they may not only know true religion but also love and practice it."

It must be confessed that until very recently the sentiments of the Apostolic Delegate on this important question of education have been misunderstood by at least a very large portion of our community. He was credited with favoring

the popular axiom of the present day which holds that "education of itself and apart from all direct religious training, is a great moral teacher," and that, therefore, the neutral school is a benefit upon which Catholics might look as fulfilling at least the principal mission of education. To those who have watched the silent undercurrent which shaped a large measure of public opinion during the controversy on the school question, the causes of such an impression on the general public are no mystery; but we are not now concerned with anything but the gratifying fact that the expressions of Mgr. Satolli's mind, as recorded in the volume before us, do not identify him with such a position. If he, with native urbanity, praises the zeal of Americans for promoting intellectual culture, he at the same time tells them that their work will derive its true advantage only from being united to positive Christian principle such as is taught in the Catholic Church. If he respects the right of American citizens to build schools in harmony with their aspirations toward a high form of secular culture, he by no means admits that the system of our public schools is one which can give unqualified satisfaction to Catholics. He holds what all really sound Catholic philosophers teach, that, to use the words of a well known English writer, "We Catholics must never acquiesce in any view of the end of man's being which does not provide in the first place for his destination to immortality, or which so limits the object of education as to aim at any less momentous result than the sanctification of his moral nature. Of this result our popular systems are found to take no account whatever."[1] No one need be told that knowledge is a good thing in itself. Nearly all the instruments of evil are good in themselves. The question with which every true lover of humanity, and of American institutions in particular, is concerned is whether education of the intellect, as provided in our public schools, really benefits the members of society *if separated from religion*, or if given *a superior claim* to

1 Oakeley, "Relations with the Young." Page 91.

the training of the heart. We all know that it is on the ground of public utility that the State bases its claim to educate our citizens, with the means placed at its disposal by the taxpaying members of the commonwealth. And we argue fairly when we say, that education without religion directly injures the child by its effects, and that hence we cannot support the system by our explicit approval. "There can be no society without religion, no religion without Christianity, no Christianity without the Church," wrote Lacordaire, the most ardent champion of republican liberty as he saw it exemplified in the Constitution of the United States. It was a conviction which the bitter experience of his own loss of faith had taught him. He had not renounced the religion the practice of which he had been taught as a child by a devoted mother, but the sentiment of faith withered within him during the years when he frequented a neutral school. "Nothing," he says, "supported our faith in a system of education in which the word of God held but a secondary place, and was enforced neither with argument nor eloquence, while at the same time we were daily engaged in studying the masterpieces and heroic examples of antiquity." The teacher who most influenced him, he tells us with bitter regret in later years, was a man who endeavored to make him gentle, chaste, sincere and generous; "but to religion he was a stranger. Had he not been wanting in that precious gift, he would have been the preserver of my soul, as he was the good genius of my intellect." [1]

This is the doctrine which one reads out of Mgr. Satolli's different utterances on the subject of education, and which has been emphasized even more distinctly in some of his recent speeches not contained in this volume.

A second topic about which much misapprehension exists in American minds is that of the union of Church and State. Not a few eminent Catholics have expressed their conviction that the separation of Church and State is the ideal to be aimed at in modern society. Now, whatever we may

1 "The Inner Life of Lacordaire," by Chocarne. Page 30.

hold regarding the *accidental* circumstances which, by placing the religious and civil governments in separate spheres, secure at the same time the greatest temporal advantages for both, yet, absolutely, the principle of separation, as vulgarly understood, is false both in practice and in theory. It is true that the Church and State are two distinct organisms having their separate functions; but it does not follow, nor is it true that God intended them to be, for a permanency, independent of each other. The Church and the State stand to each other in a relation similar to that of soul and body. The food, the exercise, in short, the means used for the cultivation of the one, are wholly distinct from those of the other. The meat which sustains the body will not suffice to feed the understanding, or *vice versa*. Nevertheless the life and activity of the soul depend in a measure on the sustenance of the body, just as the right government of the body is determined to its ultimate perfection by the understanding and the will, principal qualities of the soul. As the mutual relation of these two qualities of life, namely the physical and the psychical, may be for a time suspended because the energies of the one or of the other are absorbed in some particular direction, just so religion or the Church, which is its perfect expression, may act apart from the State without apparently influencing the same. The body may cease for a time to be influenced by the mind, because it has come under some absorbing, though not necessarily evil, influence. A frightened child seeking the light to escape the phantoms of darkness does not cease to depend on the mother from whom it flies, and who is its real guardian. The growing youth may be so absorbed in seeking the benefits of physical exercise as to lose sight of dangers which his reason bids him avoid, yet we would not say that he can permanently dispense with the use of his intelligence even for the successful cultivation of healthful animal life. So it is with the State. A government without religion may prosper for a time, but it cannot permanently do so. "In this matter," says the Apostolic Delegate, "I find a surprising want of knowledge in America." He would have us give close attention to this subject, and realize

what is absolutely true, namely, that the relations of Church and State, where both fulfil the functions assigned them, are inevitably those of the most perfect harmony.

There is, indeed, great danger in this teaching about the separation of Church and State; for, if well examined, it will be found to undermine the very fundamental truth that *God meant Christianity to be a leavening and saving influence for all human society*. We look upon Church and State as two distinct creations, instead of viewing them as two expressions of a single divine purpose, in which the one explains, informs and perfects the other. What is society but the union of individuals whom the Creator placed in mutual relation to facilitate the one object of their existence, namely, their ultimate attainment of eternal happiness, which alone answers the wants of their souls? To reach this end He gave them laws by revealing His will in definite directions. The last expression of that revelation, that divine will, is Christianity. It was not only for some, it was for all mankind. We may reject that revelation because of our free will, but to do so is an act of rebellion. In other words, we may have the right to do wrong, but we shall always have the duty to do right. And so if society chooses to ignore religion, or its only perfect expression in the Church, we cannot prevent it; but God never meant it so. The one was intended to direct the other, just as it was intended to direct each man's individual life.

It is common to refer to the historical aspect of the union of Church and State as a proof that it injures both the one and the other. It may be so in a thousand cases, but it is not necessarily so, and it is designed fundamentally to be the very opposite. If the argument were at all admissible it would undo the entire economy of salvation, for it may be applied with equal force to the individual. The fact that the weaknesses of the body often, perhaps in most cases, overpower the soul, and that the faculties of the soul may serve abuses and become the slave of the body, is no proof that the distinct functions of soul and body are to be considered independent of each other, or that the soul has no superior right

of influencing the body in man's pursuit of his one great aim. This the Apostolic Delegate sets forth in various places, showing not only that "republicanism and Catholicity have one common root," but that the Catholic Church alone can "pronounce our social *pax vobiscum.*"

The subject deserves a better treatment than we can give it here. Our object is mainly to contribute somewhat to the removing of those misapprehensions which have, without doubt, existed until very recently regarding the mind of the Apostolic Delegate on the vital topics of education and true loyalty to the State.

We trust that the remaining, as yet unpublished addresses of Mgr. Satolli, may likewise be printed in similar form, as they will offer a most interesting chapter in the history of the American Church, especially when compared with many of the contemporary reports of our journals, which often suffer from the unauthorized comments by those who are anxious to interpret the mind of authority by their own preconceived notions.

THE MORALITY OF SUICIDE.

OUR very special attention is called, just now, to a careful philosophical consideration of the question of Suicide: first, by the prevalence of the crime; secondly, by the open defense that has been made of it; thirdly, by the widely-prevalent doubt in the public mind as to whether there is any such thing at all as an unchangeable moral standard; and, finally, by the fact that very many Catholics are frequenting schools of ethics and courses of lectures in which an absolute standard of right and wrong is either denied outright or is treated as being amongst the unknowables. One who asserts an absolute standard is, in many circles, regarded as presumptuous, rash and bigoted; and even the sincere attempt to discover an absolute standard

under the conviction that it must exist is eyed with a mild pity akin to that which would be bestowed upon the man who set about determining, by count or otherwise, whether the number of the stars is odd or even.

We can readily understand how in a state of things such as this, the "ethics of the day," being without fixed fundamental principles, is anxious to shirk the ethical discussion of real, practical obligations following upon man's essential nature and the relations of man to man. When it touches man's every day life, it is afraid to go back of the civil law or the general habits—often, the general depravity—of men in a given age or race. We are presented with the ethics of the Romans, the ethics of the Greeks, the ethics of the Assyrians. A new book follows with the ethics of the Egyptians; and still another, with the ethics of the Chinese. And this is superseded by one that professes to unfold to us the ethics of the middle ages: and dear knows what is meant by the middle ages. The depravity of humanity is dramatized, and this in such a way as to make us suppose that the human heart in the variations of its wilful wickedness was all the time crediting itself with the spirit of godliness: and that men in each successive age were perfectly justified in taking for their standard simply what they did and not what they ought to have done. The standard, we are told, is "relative," "progressive," "evolutionary." Considering what so many people do, it is hardly genteel to lay down adamantine rules of morality.

In this state of things the philosophical study of moral questions becomes a matter of great consequence to those who are the authorized teachers of men. What, then, have we to say of the crime of suicide, the glorification of which is the latest defiance that has been flung in our faces?

The word *suicide* is used to express both the act of self-murder and the person who commits such act, the self-murderer. We are using the word here as meaning the act of self-murder. The act of taking away one's life may be *direct* or *indirect*. This act is said to be *direct* when the *intention is directed* precisely to the suicide and an act is done

(or omitted) by means of which (or of its omission) the intention is carried into effect. The act of taking away one's life is said to be *indirect* when something is done from which it is foreseen that death will result, but where one's own death is not intended either as an end or as a means,—the object intended being some other good. An example of direct self-destruction would be the case where one, intending to kill himself, should drive a dagger into his own heart. If, on the contrary, a father desiring to save his child from a burning house should pass through the fire and save the child, though foreseeing that the passage through the fire would certainly result in his own death, he would not be said to have taken his own life *directly* but only *indirectly*, for his intention was directed to the saving of the child, and to this only,—his own death resulting also only from a necessary means which he employed to accomplish the one end intended.

Here, then, there arise two questions. *First*, Is it ever lawful for a man to take his own life directly, that is, to intend self-destruction and to intend a means as directed to that end? *Secondly*, Is it ever lawful for a man to take his own life indirectly, that is to use a means to a further end intended, when from the means his own death will result, though his own death is wholly undesired and the means, too, is wholly undesired whether for itself or as having any connection with his own death?

First Question: Direct Suicide.—We must here take everything into consideration. There exists amongst men an innate horror of what is always spoken of (exception made above) as the *crime* of suicide. It is looked upon as leaving a lasting stain on the memory of the one who has committed it. It is looked upon as a domestic disgrace equal to or greater than any other that could befall the family within whose membership it may have been committed. One case of it is counted a greater affliction than lunacy, even hereditary lunacy; and an attempt is always made to cover up the crime by feigning the affliction of lunacy. This means that whilst in lunacy there is recognized to be freedom

from moral responsibility, and hence freedom from crime, there is, on the contrary, recognized to be in the responsible act of suicide a moral act, a deliberate act done with freedom of choice, and that such act deliberately done indicates an awful moral depravity from the taint of which men are above all things eager to preserve the fair record of their families, and the memory of those they love. We have here a dictate of nature; and when the dictates of nature are universal and constant they may not be disregarded.

What then is there in the deed that strikes men with horror? There is evident crime in the deed; evident unnatural crime which is recognized as being fraught with disaster to the one who has committed it. But if there is evident crime, there is evident violation of a law by which man in his free conduct ought to be governed. And such is the universal horror at the deed, that there must be in it evident violation of a very primary and essential law. This law must be either a divine law or a human law. It cannot be a human law, for human law cannot touch the case. When the deed is done human law cannot reach the criminal with its sanctions. It must, therefore, be a divine law. The divine law we distinguish as divine positive and as natural law. The divine positive does not enter into our examination, for it can be known to us only by supernatural revelation; and we do not here enter at all into the question of supernatural revelation. Hence the law we are looking for must be one that both can be and is manifested to us by the purely natural and unaided light of reason.

Hence we have; (1) The universal horror at suicide; (2) The common verdict that it is a crime; (3) The deduction by elimination that it is a crime against the natural law; (4) That the law which it violates must be very primary and essential. But how primary and how essential is this law? There is one law, the first and most essential of all laws imposed not on man alone but on the great university of creation. This is the law of continuance. The law of continuance in a given mode of existence until by outside physical forces that mode is changed, is a physical law imposed

upon every molecule of the universe and fulfilled unerringly by it. Outside of the conditions that can be introduced by the free will of man, this law is so absolute that no being has the power to introduce arbitrarily any changes either in regard to itself or in regard to any other being. And outside of the free action of man, all the changes that do occur and all the conditions necessary for change are themselves due to the physically absolute action of the same law. Man alone, as an intelligent being, is capable of selecting an end and of choosing means and of arbitrarily introducing conditions necessary for a change in the mode of existence of things in nature surrounding him and even of himself. Man has the physical power. But has he the moral power? Is it lawful for him to do so with all things, himself included? That is the question. In so far as the things that surround him are concerned, the use of them by man is eminently lawful and is absolutely in keeping with his needs and nature and with the manifest destiny of the rest of creation. From the study of the material universe that surrounds us, from what we see in the nature and disposition and order of its parts, it is evident that much of it, at least, is destined to the use and service of man. The nature of man is attended by many needs which have to be supplied incessantly, and can be supplied only by a judicious use of the vegetable, mineral and animal kingdoms in the midst of which he finds himself. The plant uses the mineral, and the animal uses the plant; and they do this by a physical law from which they have no escape. The one is destined by nature to subserve the other. But they are both naturally destined to subserve man. He may, therefore, dispose of them to the end to which they are naturally destined, namely, for the preservation of his own existence and the advancement of his being toward a perfection of which he is capable: and in doing so he will be acting directly according to the natural law and in perfect harmony with the order of the universe. But when it comes to the question of arbitrarily introducing those conditions which will be necessarily followed by the utter termination of his present mode of

existence, he has no rights. He has the physical power, but that is all; and the mere physical power demonstrates nothing. Physical power in man is subject in its exercise to law which binds the will that acts according to intelligence. There is nothing in man or out of him, nothing in man's nature or in the nature of the things that surround him, or in the philosophy of the universe, which can be construed into the slightest assurance that man has the permission of his Owner to put an end to his present existence. Now, without a very positive assurance of the will of the owner it is never lawful to dispose of the property of another. We say a *positive assurance;* for it is not lawful to proceed upon even a very strong probability. There is nothing in man or out of him to indicate that he has the privilege of such absolute disposal of himself. Therefore he may not presume such privilege. The use of the rest of creation to which he is entitled is for a very specific end; and its propriety is indicated by the natural and necessary connection of the use with the end. This end, which is the continuance and perfection of man's being, is not only not attainable but its attainment is absolutely thwarted by the assumption of the same jurisdiction over his own existence. Hence, the assumption of such jurisdiction is a usurpation of dominion for which in nature there is no warrant. Not only is there no warrant; but nature itself, proclaiming in its inevitable laws the will of the Creator who gave it reality, cries out against the usurpation, and by physical law up to the point of not interfering with man's physical freedom provides against the crime. Nature does this by that same physical law which urges man to instinctively dispose of the rest of creation. For, even prior to and independently of any rational choice, man's strongest tendency is the tendency to self-preservation. This it is which originally and instinctively dominates man's every other tendency, prior to the perception of end and means. It is the foreshadowing and the promulgation in instinct of that which it is later in intelligence, namely, the most wide-reaching and the most constant consequence of the innate and inevitable tendency of man to the final end

of his entire personality, to happiness. Man's tendency to self-preservation pervades all his primary instincts. It leads him to eat, to drink, to sleep, to recreate and to exercise, to work and to rest. And in this does nature from the beginning provide as far as may be a physical safeguard against the moral crime which man, in his moral nature as an intelligent free being, must necessarily be endowed with the physical power to commit.

The gravity of the crime of suicide is, then, inferred from the universality of dominion which in it is usurped over human existence. God is the owner of His creation. He is the owner of His whole creation—the free, moral being, man, included. Man, the human race entire, will never be able to claim any title by creation to the ownership of even so much as a drop of water or a grain of sand. Man is only an intelligent administrator; and he must administer according to what he perceives, in himself and in the things around him, of the will of the Sole, Absolute, Prime Owner of all. This will which is to be inferred from the consideration of the nature of things is law; it is the eternal, natural law which is based upon the nature of things. It is an essential law and unchangeable, since it is based upon the very essence of things. It is a primary law, since it affects so primary a thing as existence itself. Strike out this law, and nothing is left. Presume dominion over human existence, and you repudiate the whole moral law, bidding defiance to the Law-giver, since the execution of the moral law depends upon the primary fact of human existence.

We might go on here to draw from the consideration of human nature in its entirety and from its manifest present and future destiny the moral law by which man is to be governed in the interests of his entire personality. His existence is not the existence of the head, the hand or the foot. It is the existence of the complete personality. The freedom of his action, therefore, must be used in the interest of his personality, and not in the inordinate favor of a part, to the detriment—to the disruption of the whole. The pain in the head, the humbled pride, may no more dictate to

him the destruction of his own personality, than it may dictate to him the destruction of the personality of any other human being. All are willing to recognize that man has a right to his own existence against any arbitrary action on the part of his fellow man. And he has not only the right, he has the duty of existence against the clamor and inordinate demand of any part of himself. He has no more right to raise his hand for the destruction of himself than he has to do the same for the destruction of another. He has in the completeness of his personality rights that are sacred against the clamor of his own passions, against the partial and minor cravings, which to be satisfied or extinguished, would domineer over his physical liberty and urge him to destroy the whole. All this leads us back to the treatise on man's nature, origin and destiny (which we cannot undertake to outline here), and shows how very fundamental are the truths that have to be denied before one can enter upon the advocacy of suicide. We have chosen, in this article, to lay special stress simply upon the universal, primary tendency of man as indicative of the will of the Creator. No one objects when from man's native, inevitable, universal, tendency we deduce the general destiny of man to life in society. No one will gainsay the argument when from man's endless, ceaseless tendency to the "good" of self we deduce his final destiny to and the possible acquisition of the "summum bonum." But the conclusion is as valid, the logic as inexorable, when from man's inevitable tendency to self preservation we draw the existence of a law of self-preservation as the law which in his rational actions he must follow.

We wish to call attention here to two points. The first is, that for the establishment of certain primary and essential truths it is not always possible to construct a syllogistic demonstration. The reason of this is, that syllogistic proof is not meant to be available for the evidencing of first principles. These are to be known by intuition which is quicker, higher and less liable to be caught in the snares of error than is ratiocination. You can prove by argument that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles; but

you cannot prove by direct argument that the right angle is equal to itself, although this is a truth essentially involved in the accepted proof. You can see, you can intuit, but you cannot demonstrate. In every science demonstration is more and more eliminated as we approach the starting point. But in this connection we meet with a fact that is passing strange. We find men who are willing to admit of a demonstration and to accept the conclusion as demonstrated to evidence; but who will, nevertheless, refuse to accept the principles on which that demonstration was based, just because those principles are self-evident and neither need nor will bear the paraphernalia of argument in which to present themselves for acceptance. They implicitly admit fundamental truths ever the more and more readily the further the demonstration advances from the domain of first principles; and they deny ever the more and more stoutly as they are brought back to where they have to recognize explicitly the same fundamental truths upon which were based the conclusions so easily admitted. This paradox manifests itself especially when there is question of the principles that form the primary basis of the rule of moral life. How often does it not happen that in the later questions, such as the right to individual property and to national defense, our proofs are accepted without demur and the moral obligation of the conclusions is acknowledged by the very men who will turn around and deny the principles upon which the conclusions were ultimately based and which are so primary as to elude the tedious processes of syllogistic demonstration? They will deny that another may have the right to dispose of their property without their express permission, and this upon the principle of the right of ownership; but when you wish to make application of their principle in regard to the original, creative ownership of so precious a thing as a terrestrial human existence, they are very obtuse. They will, indeed, allow that a man may not murder another man, for, this would be to violate the rights of the other man. But they will rise no higher. May a man murder himself? O, yes, we are told, for in this he is violating nobody's rights

And so, when pushed, they always end by denying that the Creator has any rights over His creation, if not by professing to ignore His existence altogether,—all to the purpose of escaping in their evil deeds the repute of having violated a known moral law.

This brings us to the second point. We must beware of adopting a futile method which is sometimes employed to uphold the truth both in regard to suicide and in regard to many other matters. It is well worthy of remark that the men who advocate the legality of suicide are the men who make open profession of rejecting the science of natural theology in its entirety. For them, according to their profession, there is no God ; and their lips are ever ready with the philosophy of degradation, a weak-minded ridicule of the Divine attributes. And with this philosophy of ridicule which they have borrowed from the pioneers, the abettors, the exponents, the executors of that depraved society which reached its depths in the lust and head-chopping of the Reign of Terror, they stand upon the platform, call the mob around them, and repudiate the moral law, for the ready applause which they can gain from audiences that would have made prompt actors in the great tragedy. Now, I say, that a futile effort is often made to refute these apostles of immorality. For, if a man is arguing from false principles, you cannot show his conclusions to be wrong unless you force him back to the principles. If you allow a man to proceed upon the presumption that the three sides of a triangle are parallel to one another, you can never demonstrate to him or to the audience which he has impressed with his presumption, that the triangle contains three angles the sum of which is equal to two right angles. So if you allow a man to start with the assertion that there is no God, First Cause, Creator, Sovereign Master, Lord Omnipotent, and that, therefore, there is no binding law upon the human will, since, thus, there can be no moral law at all, no obligation, no duty, you can never demonstrate to him ultimately that there is a duty to abstain from suicide or from any other crime. Under this presumption, it will be just as impossible for you to prove the

moral obligation of not committing theft or murder. You must clear away the first presumption before you can advance one step.

There are certain arguments adduced to defend the legality of suicide. But they are all sophisms, and they are readily stripped of their speciousness by the application of the principles which we have presented. The whole difficulty consists in getting a hearing for the principles, for adversaries in matters of this kind when forced back to principles, will never acknowledge the truth, but will proceed forthwith to load you and your principles with scurrility and abuse. However, it may be well to repeat the chief difficulties offered. The consideration of them may help to bring out the truth more closely:

Suicide is said to be an act of fortitude. And, indeed, it is spoken of as such, at least implicitly, in many of those novels of the day which unfortunately are the only literary refection indulged in by thousands of young people. And even to this are we come, that in school exhibitions children who have "to speak a piece" are allowed to choose a selection in which the bravery of the hero culminates in suicide; and Christian audiences are rude if they do not applaud. But suicide, far from being fortitude, is the height of cowardice. It is cowardice in a panic. It is the cowardice that leaps anywhere to avoid the pain of the moment; the cowardice that rushes into the new disaster to escape the manly struggle with the partial affliction that is at hand. Justify suicide as an outlet from any one mental or bodily pain you please to choose, and you have justified it as the lawful relief from each and every mental and bodily pain. You cannot draw the line. Approve it in a single case, and you at once strike out heroism and fortitude from the list of human virtues. The evil influence of the pernicious literature of which we have spoken, be it in the form of book, newspaper or magazine, has evidenced itself in this regard; and we are now hardly startled at the suicide of pouting children. And, indeed, if you think to justify suicide for the man or woman who wishes to escape from some misery in life, you must also justify it for the boy who has been refused his antici-

pated game of base-ball, and for the girl who is told that she may not enjoy the long cherished dream of wearing her new party-gown. For certainly, at the moment, the chagrin, the misery and the grief of the boy and the girl are felt with an intensity equal to that of any discontent which can overshadow the soul of the grown-up man or woman.

Again, it is said that life is a gift; and that no one is obliged to retain a gift. Life is truly a gift. But the living of the life is also a solemn duty so long as the life shall naturally last. If the objection held, there would be no such thing as a moral law. Everything in the creation is a gift. Man's native virtue is a gift. If it were lawful for him to throw away his gifts, he might give himself over to drunkenness and every species of debauchery and still claim the repute of a righteous man.

Still again we have quoted at us the old axiom: *scienti et volenti non fit injuria*, which means that an injustice is not done to a man who both knows what is being done to him and is willing that it should be done; so that if a man is willing to suffer death at his own hands he does no injustice to himself. But first of all there is a higher power whose will has to be consulted. Besides this, the axiom is misapplied; it applies and is intended to apply to those things only over which man possesses a dominion which he is at liberty to forego. He possesses no such dominion over his own existence.

But may not a man cut off his arm or foot? If so, then he may take his life piece-meal. And if piece-meal, why not all at once? We deny that a man may cut off his arm or foot under all circumstances. He may have his arm or foot amputated for the sake of preserving his life; but this is quite a different thing from cutting it off wantonly, or for the sake of gradually depriving himself of life. The arm and the foot are integral parts of his human self which he is not authorized arbitrarily to mutilate.

Yet, is not self-destruction sometimes a means of avoiding moral evil, moral wrong-doing? Never; for, it is itself moral wrong-doing. Neither is it ever a necessary means

for the avoidance of further wrong-doing. For, further moral wrong-doing will depend ultimately upon the attitude of the will which can always keep itself in opposition.

A Special Case.—May a criminal who for the murder of a fellow citizen has been justly condemned to death by the civil authority, act as his own executioner in the name of the civil authority? We must answer negatively. But the unlawfulness of the deed becomes here more difficult to prove by argumentation than it was in the case where the sanction of the civil authority was absent. The reason of this is that the case is advanced further into the region of first principles. For here there is thrown into the question the idea, at least, of "authorization" which was absent before. There is no doubt at all that civil authority has the right to decree the death penalty as a necessary means for the preservation of society, and thus also to authorize an executioner to act in its name. But may the condemned man himself, under such authorization of the civil power, accept the office of executioner in his own case? Or, does the power of authorization belonging to the civil power extend so far that it can even impose upon the condemned man the duty or confer upon him the right (if he chooses to accept) of fulfilling the office of executioner in his own case?

We must say No. In the first place it always remains true that there is in the whole matter something abhorrent to nature, the keenness and depth of whose immediate perceptions are not to be tested or measured by the blunter and more unwieldy instrument of logical argumentation. The instincts and immediate perceptions of nature furnish the basis upon which logical argumentation must rest.

There is moreover an essential contradiction between the character of criminal and that of executioner. The criminal, in his condemnation, is declared debarred from every right and privilege of citizenship; the executioner, on the other hand, is honored with the emolument that naturally attaches to *good* citizenship, with the holding of public office. A criminal is executed always and only as being a menace to the public security. When he is condemned his existence

is supposed to be necessarily irreconcileable with the safety of the citizens and with the duties which by citizenship would devolve upon him. But when he acts as his own executioner, even in the name of the law, what does he do? He gives the very highest proof that man can be called upon to give of patriotism and of zeal for the vindication of the law. For there is no other service to society which is held to be so exalted as the giving of one's life for the public welfare. Hence, the man who would accept the office of executioner in regard to himself would, in the very act of acceptance, have given proof of his actual loyalty even to the rendering of the greatest service which man can render to his country. Thus, in so far as the execution of such a man would be meant as the removal of a person dangerous to society, it would be a contradiction. Whilst he remained in the publicly known disposition of readiness to die for the vindication of the law, he could not be looked upon as dangerous to society; and so long as he was ready to act as his own executioner, he would be in that disposition. It might be objected that the same would hold for every criminal who should profess to be willing and anxious to be put to death by the *public* executioner through pure zeal for the preservation and vindication of public order. But the objection has no weight. For, the general acceptance of such profession would be the absolute defeat of the effect of law; since every criminal would be profuse in such professions of zeal, and there could thus never be any vindication of violated justice. But here arises a great difficulty. For, if no account is to be taken of the professions of those who would say that they were anxious to be put to death by the public executioner, why should we make account of the profession of the criminal who might declare himself anxious to execute himself for the public good? I reply that practically no account can be taken of it, and that our case must remain always in the abstract. For, the profession could be certified as genuine only when ratified by the deed; and the contradiction of which we spoke could be evidenced only when beyond the reach of a remedy.

But there still remains the other reason for which the death penalty is inflicted, namely, the deterrent influence which an execution has upon the citizens to keep them from committing crime. Considering this, might the criminal undertake to execute himself under the authorization of the civil power? No. The deterrent influence of an execution lies precisely in this, that it is a punishment; that it is not voluntarily undertaken; and that thus it is inflicted by a personality distinct from the person of the condemned. The execution of self has nothing deterrent in it, since every one knows that it is a penalty that can never be imposed.

The Second Question.—We may deal very briefly with the second question, introducing it merely for the sake of completeness as we made it a quasi-division of the subject. The second question was this: Is it ever allowable for a man to put or omit an action when he foresees that from the deed or the omission of it his death will surely follow, though in the deed or omission he in no wise intends his own death? Note, that the *intention* of his own death must be excluded: such intention is clearly unlawful. Moreover, the deed or omission cannot be lawful unless there be very grave reasons for it. But can there ever be reasons grave enough to sanction such deed or omission? Again, we must postulate that the act or omission be not in itself unlawful: for there can be no reasons grave enough to lend a sanction to an act that is in itself unlawful. The best end cannot justify the use of a naturally unlawful means. But supposing that the deed or omission be in itself good or indifferent; and supposing that the intention of one's own death be altogether absent; can there be reasons grave enough to justify the deed or omission, though it be foreseen that from such deed or omission one's own death will follow?

Without going into details, we have simply to lay down the general principle which may be formulated thus: When from an act that is in itself good or indifferent there will follow two effects, the one good and the other bad, but with equal directness and certainty so that the evil effect is not more immediate or certain than the good effect, it is lawful to

put such an act, provided that only the good effect be intended and provided that the good effect intended be more important than the good which will be impeded by the fact of the evil result. The same principle holds for the omission. This is a principle that is in constant application even in the minor affairs of every day. And when we rise to those greater works in which one's own life is concerned, we find that on this principle is based the lawfulness of all deeds of heroism and patriotism; all deeds of heroic charity, of heroic patience, of heroic silence and abstention. It is always in the recognition of the validity of this principle that the soldier clings to his post; and that the clergyman, the physician and the nurse go into the haunts of pestilence.

WILLIAM POLAND, S.J.

St. Louis University.

THE LIBRARY OF A PRIEST.

DEPARTMENT OF CHURCH HISTORY.

IN the following list we offer a representative selection, rather than a complete list, of the works on Church History which would prove serviceable to a priest.

DE SMEDT, S.J.: *Introductio Generalis ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, 1 vol., 1876. The classical Catholic work on the subject by the great Bollandist—a work, however, more for the student than the general reader of Church History.

DE SMEDT, S.J.: *Principes de la Critique Historique.* 1 vol. 1883. A most suggestive book for the worker in Church History, and a book, too, of very general interest.

FELLER: *Biographie Universelle.* Many different editions. Not a critical work, but very useful for its short biographies of men not usually noticed in English or American publications of this kind.

WERNER, S.J.: *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus.* 1 vol. 1890. —*Atlas Missionum.* 1 vol. An ecclesiastical atlas.

WETZER & WELTE: *Kirchen Lexicon*, (2d Edition, 1879.) The new edition of this great work in German was begun by Card. Hergenroether and is being continued by Prof. Kaulen. It is being translated also into French.

MANUALS OF CHURCH HISTORY:—

ALZOG. 3 vols. The best in English.

DARRAS. 4 vols. Readable but unreliable.

HERGENROETHER. 3 vols. As yet only in German and French. Notable for bibliographies.

GILMARTIN. 2 vols. Down to the Reformation.

KRAUS. 3 vols. As yet only in German and French. Notable for bibliographies.

FUNK. 2 vols. As yet only in German and French.

DOELLINGER. 2 vols. In German only,—incomplete.

BERTI: *Eccles. Historiae Breviarium.* 2 vols. Continued by Lopez down to 1879.

LARGER HISTORIES OF THE CHURCH:—

ROHRBACHER. Several editions. In French and German. 14 vols. with an index and two vols. suppl. annals.

DARRAS. 44 vols. In French.

JUNGMANN. *Dissertationes Selectae.* 7 vols. 1880–87. This is not a complete History of the Church but it covers most of the questions of Church History.

BUTLER: *Lives of the Saints.* Many different editions.

SMITH & WACE: *Dictionary of Christian Biography.* 4 vols. 1877-1887. All the contributors to this work are Protestants, but the tone is generally fair and always scholarly. It covers the first eight centuries.

HEFELÈ: *History of the Councils.* 10 (12) vols. Several editions. Original in German. Translated into French. The 1st vol. in English in Clark's Theological Library, (3 vols.) Invaluable as a reference work.

MARTIGNY: *Dictionnaire d'antiquités chrétiennes.* 1 vol. Edition of 1877.

SMITH & CHEETHAM: *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.* 2 vols. A Protestant work, somewhat behind in results of Catacomb discoveries and naturally somewhat biased.

ADDIS & ARNOLD: *A Catholic Dictionary.* 1 vol.

WORKS ON SPECIAL PERIODS:—

Some of the sources of early Church History are easily obtained.

EUSEBIUS, SOCRATES, SOZOMEN, THEODORET,—each forms a volume in the *Bohn Library* series of *English translations.*

ACTA MARTYRUM. Edited by Dom Ruinart. Last edition Ratisbon, 1859.

ALLIES: *The Formation of Christendom.* 2 vols. A popular edition in 1 vol. has been published

PALMA: *Praelectiones Historicae.* Contains arguments on the chief topics of Church History down to the sixteenth century.

ALLARD: *Histoire des Persécutions.* 5 vols. The classical modern book on the Persecutions.

NORTHCOTE & BROWNLOW'S: *Roma Sotteranea.* 3 vols.

DE SMEDT, S. J.: *Dissertationes Selectae in I^am. Aetatem Hist. Eccles.* 1 vol. 1876.

LILLY: *Chapters of European History.* 2 vols.

The Lives of St. Peter and St. Paul, by the Abbé Fouard, the *Fabiola* of Card. Wiseman and *Callista* of Card. Newman, might form a very useful addition to a small collection of books of early Church History.

DE BROGLIE: *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au IV Siècle.* 6 vols.

S. LIGUORI: *History of Heresies.* 2 vols.

MRS. HOPE'S: *The Conversion of the Teutonic Races.* 2 vols.

The works of *Ozanam* (on the Franks and Germans and Middle Ages generally), of *Lingard* (on the Anglo-Saxons), of *Montalembert* (the Monks of the West), of *Allies*, (Peter's Rock in Mohammed's Flood). etc.

Lives of S. Augustine (by a Priest of the Mission), *S. Patrick* (by F. Morris), *S. Gregory Great* (by Abbot Snow), *S. Boniface* (by Mrs. Hope).

PARSON'S: *Studies in Church History.* 1 vol. Takes up disputed questions of the first eight centuries.

ON THE MIDDLE AGES:—

DIGBY: *Mores Catholici.* 4 vols. in last edition. Of this work Adams in his Manual of Historical Literature says: "A work of remarkable erudition in sharp contrast with the hasty generalizations of Lecky."

MAITLAND: *The Dark Ages.* 1 vol.

DRANE: *Christian Schools and Scholars.* 1 vol.

CHRISTOPHE: *Histoire de la Papauté pendant le XIV. Siècle.* 3 vols.

PASTOR: *History of the Popes* (from the end of the Middle Ages.) 3 vols. in German. First two volumes of the German have been thus far translated into English by the English Oratorians, in four volumes, bringing the work up to 1484.

CREIGHTON: *History of the Papacy.* 5 vols. thus far, comprising the period from 1292 to 1527. Protestant Bishop of Peterborough, generally very fair.

HERGENROETHER: *The Church and State.* 2 vols. in English translation. The ablest apology for the secular history of the Papacy.

BIOGRAPHIES:—

Of ST. GREGORY VII. Many biographies, by Prot. Bowen in English.

Of ST. BERNARD, by Ratisbonne (Cath.), Storrs (Prot.).

Of ST. THOMAS A BECKET, by Morris.

Of INNOCENT III., by Hurter in German and French.

Of ST. DOMINIC, by Drane.

Of ST. FRANCIS, by E. A. Starr, (Mrs. Oliphant, Prot.).

Of ST. THOMAS OF AQUIN. 2 vols. by Vaughan, notable for its account of early Scholasticism.

Of ALBERT THE GREAT, Sighart.

Of ST. EDMUND RICH, Wallace.

Of ST. CATHERINE OF SIENA. 2 vols. Drane.

THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION:—

JANSSENS: *The History of the German People from the close of the Middle Ages.* 8 vols. This great classic, one of the best works of the century, has been translated from the German into French,—as yet untranslated into English.

SPALDING: History of the Reformation. 2 vols. Answer to D'Aubigné.

BALMES: *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared.* 1 vol.

PALLAVICINI, S.J.: *The Council of Trent.* In Latin, Italian and French.

GASQUET, O.S.B.: *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries.* 2 vols.

RANKE: *History of the Popes.* 1 vol. The work of the Protestant Historian.

PARSONS: *Some Lies and Errors of History.* 1 vol. A popular refutation.

BRIDGETT: *Blunders and Forgeries.* Referring to English History only.

BIOGRAPHIES:—

LIFE OF CARD. XIMENES. Hefelè, translated into English.

LIFE OF SAVONAROLA. 2 vols. Villari in English translation.

LIFE OF LEO X. 2 vols. Roscoe—somewhat antiquated.

LIFE OF LUTHER. Audin ("full of errors"—Alzog).

LIFE OF ST. CHARLES BORROMEO.—

LIFE OF BL. THOMAS MORE. F. Bridgett.

LIFE OF BL. JOHN FISHER. F. Brigdett.

LIFE OF F. GERARD (the Gunpowder Plot). Brother Foley.

LIFE OF M. OLIER. Edw. Healey Thompson.

LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

LIFE OF SIXTUS V. Hubner (in French).

LIFE OF ST. IGNATIUS.

LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER.

MARSHALL: *Christian Missions.* 2 vols. Has been charged with exaggeration, which does not, however, deprive the work of its value as a comparative index of Catholic and Protestant methods.

PARKMAN: *The Jesuits in North America.* Frequently misleading.

J. G. SHEA: *History of the Catholic Church in the United States.* 4 vols.

MANNING: *England and Christendom.*
NEWMAN: *Historical Sketches, etc.*
REVIEWS:—
Dublin Review.
Revue des Questions Historiques.
The English Historical Review. A Protestant magazine, notable for book reviews.

AUSTIN E. DOWLING.

St. John's Theological Seminary,
Boston, Mass.

CONFERENCES.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND OBSTETRICAL SCIENCE.

The readers of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW will remember our extended and thorough discussion of craniotomy and kindred obstetrical operations, to which the leading Catholic theologians, such as PP. Lehmkuhl, S.J., Aertnys, C. SS. R., Sabetti, S.J., and others contributed, and in which some sixty medical doctors, eminent in their profession, gave their written opinions. The articles were reproduced in part and also discussed in the *Revue Romaine* and other periodicals; nevertheless, it is to be wished that they had been given a more extended publicity among medical men of a more or less pronounced tendency toward a pagan standard of ethics. A German medical journal recently opened the topic anew, and declared that P. Lehmkuhl, S.J. advocates the practice of craniotomy in certain cases. The article was reported in the *Medical Record* of New York, and P. Sabetti took occasion to answer, or rather to correct the grossly erroneous assumption that Catholic theologians, much less the Church, were tolerant of the practice of craniotomy. We reproduce P. Sabetti's paper as it appeared in the *Medical Record*. It will serve as a supplementary chapter to the controversy contained in previous volumes of the REVIEW. (Cf. Vol. II, 467; V, 171 and 215; IX, 35, 343 and 360; X, 12, 64 and 461; XI, 127).

An article entitled "The Catholic Church and Obstetrical Science," in the *Medical Record* of February 2, 1895, page 147, has lately been shown to me, and I consider it my duty, for the sake of Christian ethics and for the information of many members of the noble profession your periodical so ably represents, to protest against the utterly loose and misleading statements it contains.

The article is short and claims to be a summary of the views expressed by an anonymous writer in the *Münchener Medicinische Wochenschrift*, with regard to the lawfulness of craniotomy. The objectionable statements, implied or explicit, may be reduced to three: *a*, That Rome has never condemned craniotomy; *b*, that Catholic theologians, and in particular the Jesuit Father Lehmkuhl, are in favor of it; and *c*, that this operation in itself is not wrong, for it is demanded both by necessity and science.

To show how untenable these views are I might refer the reader to a letter published over my name in the *Medical Record*, November 28, 1885, page 606. But a few additional remarks, I am sure, will not prove unacceptable to the medical profession.

With regard to the attitude of Rome the "anonymous writer," as reported and summarized by the reviewer in the *Medical Record*, has the following: "The question was submitted whether craniotomy or any operation directly tending to destroy the life of the fœtus in utero was ever justifiable." The Sacred Congregation replied that "after mature deliberation it would advise the questioner to follow the most approved authorities, whether ancient or modern, and act prudently." Were this the only document promulgated by the Church in the matter of craniotomy, the inference made by the "anonymous writer" would not be entirely without reason. But this is another case of where not to tell the whole truth is just as bad as not to tell the truth at all. We have, as a matter of fact, four answers from Rome on this question. The first was given November 28, 1872, by the Sacred Penitentiary, during the first stage of the discussion. The question, be it remarked, had been mooted only a little before that time by Dr. Avanzini, editor of the *Acta S. Sedis*. This is the answer quoted by the "anonymous writer." The second answer was given December 10, 1883, to Mons. Dabert, Bishop of Périgneux, in France. In it Cardinal Bilio states that the Sacred Congregation of Inquisition is still examining the question, and has not yet reached a final decision. Here are his words: "The third doubt (proposed by you, and concerning craniotomy) being the subject of many inquiries made by other Bishops, is still under consideration by this Sacred Tribunal." The third answer is dated May 31, 1884, and was sent by Cardinal Monaco La Valletta to Cardinal Caverst, Archbishop of Lyons. The whole document runs thus: "The cardinals of this congregation have carefully weighed the doubt proposed by your Eminence, as to whether it would be safe to

teach in Catholic schools that the surgical operation called craniotomy is lawful, when on the one hand mother and child will die, if recourse is not had to the operation, and on the other, if such recourse is had, the mother will be saved at the expense of the child's life. After long and mature consideration, after close scrutiny of the views advocated in this matter by Catholic men of science and submitted by your Eminence to this congregation, we think it incumbent on us to answer that 'It cannot be safely taught.'" Rome spoke for the fourth time on August 19, 1889, reiterating the same decision. The entire text of this document can be found in the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, vol. ix., page 352. We content ourselves with the following short extract: "We, the cardinals in committee assembled, have come to this conclusion that in accordance with the declaration made on May 28, 1884, it cannot be safely taught in Catholic schools that the surgical operation known as craniotomy is lawful, and the same is to be said of whatever surgical operation aims directly at the killing of the fœtus or of the pregnant mother. I acquaint your Lordship with this decision that you make it known to the professors of the medical faculty of the Catholic University of Lille."

The very tenor of these answers, the way they have been accepted and understood by theologians and professors in all the Catholic Colleges and Universities, the injunction that they should be made known to the members of the medical faculty, and the admission therein contained that craniotomy is one of those surgical operations which are and must be called *directe occisivae*, truly murderous, preclude every other abstract and otherwise possible interpretation of the *Tuto doceri non posse*, except the practical one, *i. e.*, that craniotomy is unlawful, morally unlawful, always and intrinsically unlawful. In addition to this I may remark here, what I stated elsewhere more fully, that an opinion which cannot safely be taught will never be held as probable by Catholic theologians. Hence it follows that, as a solid probability is certainly required for an act which is *prima facie* murderous, no Catholic will ever be allowed to connive at, and still less to perform, the surgical operation of craniotomy. Rome, indeed, could not have spoken more clearly, and when we reflect that her utterances have been public property for the past ten years, one cannot but be surprised that the "anonymous writer," dignified by the editor of the *Münchener Medicinische Wochenschrift* with the title of "inspired," failed to give them a place in his article. Inspiration is a term that admits

of many meanings, but we had always thought it too sacred a thing to be confounded with ignorance. That the "anonymous writer" derived his inspiration, in this instance, from ignorance is a conviction that must force itself on any honest reader; for we cannot suppose for moment that malice could have ever moved his pen.

The varying stages of controversy through which this question has passed, and the prudent circumspection of Rome in the premises are sufficient explanation of the stand taken by theologians at successive intervals. Father Lehmkuhl and others during the first period of discussion admitted doubts and ventured tentative solutions, but afterwards fell into line, and now all to a man brand as morally unlawful craniotomy and every such operation. Here again the "anonymous writer" has not told the whole truth by not quoting Lehmkuhl in his last editions, where, taking the inspiration from Rome, as every true theologian does, he clearly condemns craniotomy.

What should we think of a writer who, wishing to prove, in our days, that the "income-tax" is perfectly constitutional, quotes an author who gave his views while this question was being discussed before the highest tribunal in our country? Would this be fair, especially if the decision given by the court is not at the same time made known? And what if the author whose views have been given as an argument had modified them and made them agree with the decision of the Supreme Court? This, and not less than this, is what the "anonymous writer" has done in regard to Lehmkuhl.

If both Rome and theologians condemn craniotomy, it is useless for Catholics to inquire whether any intrinsic reason may be found in its favor. Moreover, the question has been too extensively treated during these recent years to need now any additional explanation or comment. Indeed it must be asserted that apart from a certain sentimentalism, nothing has ever been brought forward to justify craniotomy from an ethical point of view. Craniotomy must be called to-day, as it was called many years ago by Archbishop Kenrick, of Baltimore, *immane facinus*, a monstrous crime. And to speak of "science" and "necessity" that we may connive at such crime is, to say the least, ridiculous. Science is advanced only by truth, and necessity, however great, cannot be admitted as an excuse for evil doing. Is it not to be wondered at how inconsistent some of our friends are, who while they are perpetually slandering the Jesuits for that famous "The end justifies the

means," wish to kill the child in order to save the mother? The Jesuits will never allow craniotomy for that very reason, because the end does not justify the means.

A. SABETTI, S.J.,
Professor of Moral Theology.
Woodstock College, Md.

OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE.

A solemn celebration in honor of Our Lady of Guadalupe, who is, under a special title, the patroness of the Church of America, has been decided upon by the ecclesiastical authorities. Under the banner of a common veneration for her who is the queen and protectress of Catholics whatever their nationality, it will tend to harmonize and bring into closer relation the widely separated interests of Northern and Southern America. In a paper in this month's REVIEW we explain the position which the feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe holds in the ecclesiastical calendar, and by what historical title she is venerated as the particular patron of these countries of the New World.

THE SUICIDE MANIA.

A few days ago, the novelty of a "Suicide Club," established or to be established in New York, was discussed by various American newspapers. The abnormal increase of suicides in late years, had previously raised the question of the cause of such an evil; but we seem to have arrived at that stage of retrogression toward paganism when the principles of the old Stoics are to assert their power of stamping vice with the seal of virtue. The article of Father Poland, S.J., Professor at St. Louis University, deals with the question as a living and presently important issue, and we commend its attentive perusal on account of the solid philosophical basis upon which he builds his argument.

THE "PROPAGANDA" AND THE MANITOBA SCHOOL CONTROVERSY.

In another part of this number of the REVIEW, we reproduce in full the text of a letter recently sent by the Congregation of the S. Propaganda to the Canadian hierarchy. It declares not only in favor of the just claims of the Catholics, but, incidentally, emphasizes the doctrine of the Church in reference to the neutral public schools.

Protestant papers, in treating this question, have falsely asserted that Canadian Catholics are hostile to public school education. This is a misrepresentation of facts. The Catholics of Manitoba, when in the majority, established public schools and allowed non-Catholics every right and privilege to which their representation entitled them. It is only now, when the non-Catholic element has gained the ascendancy, and gained it precisely by reason of the liberality and the fair-minded policy of the Manitoba Catholics, that the newly formed Protestant majority begins to deny to their Catholic brethren those same rights which the latter accorded every citizen irrespective of creed, when they had it in their power to legislate.

The question is of direct interest to Catholics in the United States, because they are not wholly free from misrepresentations and injuries similar to those which beset our Canadian neighbors. It ought to be understood that Catholics are not hostile to the public schools, in the way in which that charge is usually made against us. We care not what schools parents may choose for their children, but we cannot approve for our own children a system of education which practically excludes religious training; nor is it just to force us, as the minority, to contribute toward the erection and support of such schools as we cannot, under ordinary circumstances, in conscience accept. We say under ordinary circumstances, because, as a rule, neutral schools are a positive danger to the faith and religious morals of the children who frequent them. "*The opinion, that the so-called neutral schools present no danger, and that Catholic children may frequent them without harm, is altogether erroneous,*" says the document

to which reference has been made. "*The very exclusion of the true religion from the curriculum of the neutral schools is an injury, since it removes religion from the position of that primary influence which it should exercise upon the daily life of man, but particularly upon the education of children. It is wrong to assert that this deficiency can be supplied, as far as need be, by the care of parents at home. For such care can only in part remedy the evil and is no excuse for the grievous wrong done in sending children to schools from which the teaching of God is excluded. Is not the dignity of religion itself greatly lowered in the estimation of the child by the fact that that religion must be banished within the domestic walls, as if it were something of which they must be ashamed in public? Moreover, what guarantee is there that the carelessness of parents or their manifold occupations will not prevent the child from receiving religious instruction outside the school hours?*

Whence it follows that nothing is so well calculated to preserve the faith in our people, especially in these times of manifold aggressive errors, than to implant, and nourish, and strengthen religion and piety in the young hearts of our children by means of Catholic schools, so that they may be instructed and deeply imbued with the doctrines of Christian life, at the same time that they learn the rudiments of letters and the liberal arts, and that by this means they may remain firmly attached to their religion during the rest of their lives. He who gives his best zeal and efforts to this work, is rightly to be judged most deserving of his religion."

Such are the words addressed to the Canadian hierarchy. And the Holy See praises them for their prudence, their firmness and unanimity in maintaining, without swerving, the rights of the faithful committed to their care in the matter of a thoroughly religious training, together with that culture of the mind in which the Catholic schools in Canada have never been wanting.

COLOR AND NUMBER OF THE LIGHTS BEFORE THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Qu. 1°. Is there any Rubric stating that the lamp before the altar of the Blessed Sacrament should show a *red* light?

2°. Is it permissible to have lamps of the same color as that before the Blessed Sacrament, or any other color, burning on the *Sanctuary* before side altars, or before statues or pictures of our Lord or the Saints?

Such a custom exists in certain churches, and some priests are of the opinion that there should be *one* sanctuary lamp—the one before the Blessed Sacrament—and no other.

Resp. No definite color is prescribed for the light that must always burn before the Blessed Sacrament.

The *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* and the *Rituale Romanum* are silent about the color of the light, though quite explicit about the light itself. We may add, too, that the Commentators we have seen say nothing about the subject in question. In "Instructions on Ecclesiastical Building," by St. Charles Borromeo, though the Saint gives minute descriptions of the kind and number of the lamps to be used in a church, he makes no mention of an necessary color for the light. "The lamps," he says, "may be of silver or of brass, as also of gold . . . with the addition of a small glass vessel, placed inside, for the use of the light. But in mountainous places, where the cold is severe, and where in winter glass vases often break from the frost, it is allowable to use small vessels of bronze to place inside the lamp."

The second question, therefore, resolves itself into this: Is it permissible to have lamps burning on the Sanctuary before side altars, or before statues or pictures of our Lord, or the Saints? We think that it is allowable. Certainly, there can be no doubt about the lamps before side altars, for the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* distinctly says that, besides the lamps before the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is kept, "ante reliqua singula altaria singulae possunt lampades appendi." As regards images and pictures, De Herdt says: "Plures (lampades) etiam ante tabernaculum, quam ante

aliud quodcumque altare, imaginem aut statuam juxta caeremoniale semper ardere debent." In our last quotation, from De Herdt, we see that the lamps before the Blessed Sacrament should be greater in number than before any other altar in the church. The *Caeremoniale* would have three or five lamps burning before the tabernacle, while St. Charles suggests, in larger churches, even more. "In smaller churches," he says, "three or five lamps should be attached to a *lampadarium* made longwise; and seven or even thirteen in larger churches." The general law, however, as expressed in the *Rituale Romanum*, is: "Lampades coram eo (tabernaculum) plures, vel saltem una, die noctuque perpetuo colluceat." De Herdt sums up the question in these words, part of which we have already quoted: "Plures lampades laudabiliter ardent, praecipue in majoribus ecclesiis et cathedralibus, pro quibus caeremoniale Ep. (Lib. I. C. 12, N. 17.) praescribit, ut *ad minus tres accensae tota die adsint;* plures etiam ante tabernaculum, quam ante aliud quodcumque altare, imaginem aut statuam juxta caeremoniale semper ardere debent: una autem ubique saltem est de praecepto." . . . We might call attention to the fact that the lamps should be of an odd number, for the reasons which the *Caeremoniale Ep.* gives: "Tum ad cultum et ornatum, tum ad mysticum sensum." The "mystic sense" of the odd numbers one, three, five and seven, for instance, readily suggests itself as, respectively, the Unity of God, the Trinity, the Five Wounds, and the Seven Sacraments or the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost.

VIATICUM.

Qu. May Viaticum be given to one in danger of death, when the danger is not from the patient's *present* state of *sickness*? By answering the above question, you will oblige several subscribers, and, in my judgment, you will benefit many poor souls who die without the grace and comfort of the Blessed Sacrament, because of the fearfulness of some priests who will not administer the last Sacraments, unless they have almost certitude that their patient is

in periculo mortis, in the sense in which theologians understand that phrase. . . .

SACERDOS.

Our inquirer gives as a reason for his question, a case to which he was called in the exercise of his ministry. He tells us that the patient was suffering from a disease that threatened his reason, but which would not necessarily kill him: but the patient preferred to risk an extremely dangerous operation—his only hope of relief—rather than live on in danger of one day becoming a raving maniac. SACERDOS heard the patient's confession, and promised to bring Holy Communion to him the next day. The patient then said that the operation would take place early the next morning and that *he could not fast*, as he was obliged to take medicine during the night, as well to relieve the pain as to prepare him for the coming ordeal. Thereupon SACERDOS told him he need not attempt to fast ; and on the following day, gave him Holy Communion, *per modum Viatici*, on the ground that his patient was *in periculo mortis*.

Resp. Theologians say that the Blessed Sacrament may be given to one, not fasting, who is in danger of death from any cause :—

"Non jejunus licite communicat in periculo mortis, ex quacumque causa proveniat." The fact that Viaticum may be given to one who is condemned to death, and who is not fasting, will readily recur to us. A prudent doubt that a patient will not be able to receive the Blessed Eucharist at a future time is all the Ritual seems to require : "Pro Viatico autem ministrabit (Parochus), cum probabile est, quod eam amplius sumere non poterit." And in the next sentence we read : "Potest quidem Viaticum brevi morituris dari non jejunis." The patient in the case is certainly *in periculo mortis*, and, moreover, there is a probability that he may not be able to receive the Blessed Sacrament again, even should he live some hours after the operation ; for the ether administered in all surgical cases is apt to unsettle the patient's stomach for some time after.

Our judgment, therefore, is that SACERDOS acted wisely, since Viaticum may be given to one in danger of death, though he be not fasting, and even though the danger is not from present sickness. Palmieri (A. Ballerini Opus Theologicum Morale, Vol. IV., Tract. x., c. ii., n. 179.) gives the whole solution in the following lines: "Adverte tandem cum Lugo l. c. n. 72. quod et A (Ballerini) docet resol. I. facultatem communicandi absque ieiunio in mortis periculo non limitari ad aegrotos, sed locum habere in iis etiam, qui iuste vel iniuste interficiendi sunt vel certe sunt in eiusdem mortis periculo, Si ex. gr. periculosum praelium sit committendum, vel instet periculosa navigatio nec possunt commode expectare, ut sequenti die ieiuni communicent."

THE BROWN SCAPULAR.

Qu. Is it necessary to say any special prayers for the Brown Scapular?

Resp. No. The only obligation is to be duly invested and to wear the Scapular. For those, however, who would gain the *Sabbatine Privilege* it is necessary, besides wearing the Scapular, (1) to observe chastity according to one's state of life, and (2) to recite in Latin the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin daily, or, if this is not possible, to abstain from flesh meat on all Wednesdays and Saturdays. Those obliged to the canonical hours need not say the Little Office, or do anything in its stead. Those, moreover, who cannot either say the Little Office or abstain, may have the second condition commuted by a priest who has the proper faculties.

For full explanation of Brown Scapular, etc., see AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for April, 1889.

ANALECTA.

LITTERAE S. P. LEONIS PP. XIII.

CIRCA CONSOCIATIONEM DOMINICAE REQUIEI.

Dilecto Filio Æmilio Keller Com. Praesidi Consociationis "du Repos du Dimanche," Parisios.

LEO PP. XIII.

Dilecte Fili, salutem et apostolicam Benedictionem.

Scire te plane volumus, magnopere Nos litteris tuis delectatos, iis nimirum quae de Consociatione *Requiei Dominicae tuendae* plura significabant, eaque ad cognoscendum periucunda. Abundat profecto Gallia vestra rebus, actuosa civium virtute pie atque utiliter institutis : sed consociationem de qua loquimur, cui praees ipse, in iis enumerandum judicamus, quae maxime excellunt, propter nobilitatem sanctitudinemque propositi : illuc quippe per se ac directe spectat ut honor Deo justus ac debitus ut par est, cessando habeatur; quod ipsemet jam ab initio legis veteris gravissime praeceperat.

Igitur communem operam vestram tanto et lubentius probamus et amantius complectimur, quanto maiora mala privatim et publice parit diei dominici contempta religio. Te quidem, dilecte Fili, sodalesque tuos tam bene animatos gratulatione potius quam hortatione prosequi ratio est : nihilominus tamen volumus, ut quod ad hanc diem sponte fecistis, idem perseveretis suasu etiam Nostro facere in posterum.

Respiciat benigne Deus industriam vestram laboremque multiplicem ejus caussa susceptum : divinorumque munerum velut auspicium ac pignus est apostolica benedicto, quam tibi, dilecte Fili et quotquot tam salutare institutum persequuntur, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die XV Martii anno MDCCCLXXXXV. Pontificatus Nostri decimo octavo.

LEO PP. XIII.

EX S. CONGREGATIONE CONCILII.

ROMANA.

DUBIUM QUOAD MISSAE APPLICATIONEM.

(*Per Summaria precum*).

Quum S. Congregationi De Propaganda Fide Ioannes Hofman Vicarius Apostolicus *loci* Chan-Si Meridionalis in Imperio Sinensi sequens obtulerit dubium: "*An Sacerdos in exequiis persolvendis Missam celebrans, non recepto stipendio, debeat pro ipso defuncto, vel potius pro aliis petentibus et eleemosynam afferentibus sacrificium applicare queat;*" eadem S. C. quaestionem H. S. C. pro congrua solutione remittit.

Iam ex enunciato dubio patet, hic quaeri an Parochus, Missionarius, vel quisque alius sacerdos rogatus ut Missam quoque celebret in exequiarum perfunctione, quin eleemosynam recipiat nec de applicanda Missa exquiratur, an hic Sacerdos annuens postulationi et Missam celebrans teneatur etiam pro defuncto Sacrificium offerre, vel potius pro alio eleemosynam offerente vel in suam particularem intentionem Missam applicare queat.

Ratio cum primis dubitandi ex ipso Rituali Romano provenit. In titulo enim—*De Exequiis*—haec habet: "Quod antiquissimi est instituti, illud quantum fieri poterit, retineatur ut Missae praesente corpore defuncti pro eo celebrentur antequam sepulturae tradatur." Cuius praescriptionis hanc fuisse mentem patet, ut Missa praesente cadavere celebretur, pro eo defuncto applicanda; ait enim Rubrica "*pro eo celebrentur.*"

Id aliunde docet ipsa Ritus natura, non enim ad pompam Missae celebrationem desiderat, praecipit Ecclesia, sed plane in bonum defuncti spirituale, in peccatorum satisfactionem particularem. Inquam "*particularem*" si enim Ecclesia tantum exquireret fructum *generalem* a quacumque Missa fidelibus vivis et defunctis derivatum, supervacaneum omnino esset instare ut Missae celebrarentur praesente cadavere; pompa enim et solemnitas augeretur, sed fructus expiatorius non augeretur sane.

Eo magis quod nimis urgenda non est ratio non accepti stipendii, non solum ne turpis redoleat avaritiae labes, sed etiam quia in eleemosynis dari solitis pro cadaveris associatione et exequiis, commode comprehenditur etiam congrua retributio pro Missae applicatione.

In casu enim quo Missa exequias comitetur et compleat, funebre

officium quid unum evadit integro directum in satisfactionem defuncti, quodque proinde una retributio etsi parva, ad instar eleemosynae Sacerdoti oblata, sufficienter amplectitur.

Sed contra est, in Missae Sacrificio apprime considerari triplicem fructum ; primum, *generalissimum* cuius fideles omnes fiunt participes ; alterum *specialissimum* quo fruitur Sacerdos ; tertium, qui dicitur *medius* quemque iis Sacerdos applicat pro quibus Sacrificium offert : ita iuxta communem Doctorum sententiam, uti videre est apud Bened. XIV. "*De Sacrif. Missae*" lib. iii, c. viii.

Hac de causa non repugnat quod Missa *De Requie* in paramentis nigris et proprio ritu celebrata, a Sacerdote applicetur *pro vivis* ; uti reposuit S. Rituum Congr. *die 13 oct. 1856 Dubio: An liceat Sacerdotibus uti paramentis nigris et celebrare Missam de Requie ut satisfaciant obligationi quam susceperunt celebrandi pro vivis* respondens : *Affirmative modo non diverse praescripserit qui dedit eleemosynam.* Item ex responsione eiusdem S. C. in die Commemorationis Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum possunt Missae applicari etiam pro vivis.

Sacra vero Cong. Indulgentiarum interrogata : *Utrum Sacerdos satisfaciat obligationi celebrandi Missam pro defuncto servando ritum feriae vel cuiuscumque Sancti etiamsi non sit semiduplex aut duplex, die 2 Aprilis 1840*, respondit : *Affirmative.*

Re quidem vera Ecclesia obsecrationibus et S. Liturgiae precibus pro universis fidelibus Deum deprecatur in Sacrificio Missae per Sacerdotis ministerium, unde significatur et obtinetur fructus Missae *generalissimus* in omnes christianos diffusus ; sed superest fructus *medius* a sacerdote applicandus cui de iure vel de eius voluntate tribuendus erit. Quare distingui necessario debet *celebratio* Missae a Missae *applicatione* ratione fructus spiritualis, adeo ut quis teneri potest ad celebrandam Missam, sed non ad applicandam. Quare Benedictus XIV *in opera citato l. c. c.* 9, docet aliquem posse in legato condendo Sacerdotem adstringere ad Missas celebrandas et non ad easdem pro fundatore applicandas, vel pro certo numero solum exigere celebrationem, non Missarum applicationem.

Ex principiis supra statutis ac quaestioni pressius pertinens, descendit responsio data a S. C. S. Officii *die* 1 *Septembris* 1841, quaestioni, *an in celebratione nuptiarum Sacredos teneretur celebrare pro sponsis:* Responsum enim fuit : "*Sacerdos non tenetur applicare pro sponsis nisi ab eisdem eleemonsynam recipiat.*" Ni-

hilominus Rituale Romanum praescribit quasi partem ritus nuptialis integrantem quod "Sacerdos Missam pro sponso et sponsa ut in Missali Romano celebret. . . ." Ecclesia vero suam obtinet intentionem ex simplici Missae celebratione in qua ferventiores pro sponsis Deo preces effunduntur et benedictiones adprecantur. Item in Missa pro defunctis Ecclesia suo nomine per ministerium Sacerdotis orat ad obtinendum fidelibus demortuis fructum satisfactorium et defuncti praesente cadavere, peculiares pro eodem offert in Sacrificio Missae supplicationes.

Nullus vero amplius videtur esse locus dubitationi, si animadvertatur, verba Ritualis Romani non continere praeceptum ut Missa celebretur pro defuncto, eius praesente cadavere, sed simpliciter laudare morem et consuetudinem seu "Quod antiquissimi est instituti illud quantum fieri poterit, retineatur ut Missae praesente corpore defuncti pro eo celebrentur, antequam sepulturae tradatur."

Sed quam in partem quaestio resolvi debeat, deliberabunt EE. PP.

Quare ecc.

Omnibus perpensis, die 27 Aprilis 1895 Emi Patres responderunt:

Negative ad I^um. Affirmative ad II^um.

II.—BERGOMEN.

TESTAMENTI.

Ultima testatoris voluntas instar legis est habenda; neque adversus eam aliae admittuntur dispositiones nisi evidenter probentur.

Sub die 6 Aprilis 1888 Sacerdos Carolus parochus in dioecesi Bergomensi per publicum notarium, rite condito testamento, reliquit beneficio parochiali domum a se possessam sub expressa conditione quod exclusive adhibenda esset pro habitatione viceparochi seu coadiutoris paroeciae. Parocho Carolo demortuo, beneficio parochiali domus unita fuit, et novus parochus relativa gubernio tributa contulit cumque viceparochus suo habitationis iure uti nollet, eo quia ex testatoris voluntate huius fratris uxor inibi habitabat, domum locavit et usque in praesens locationis fructus quasi res beneficiales sibi retinuit. Verum ecclesiae Fabrica sibi locationis fructus vindicat ea de ratione quia testatoris mens fuit in leganda domo subveniendi Fabricae pergravatae onere solvendi

coadiutori expensas locationis domus. Quare Fabrica expostulat modo etiam fructus iure perceptos a parocho pro praeterito sive ex locatione in futurum percipiendos.

Fabricae ecclesiae moderatores ut suam intentionem probent, referunt defunctum parochum morti proximum eis mandasse ut notarium vocarent pro testamento exarando. Huic autem ad se accersito mentem suam manifestasse relinquendi Fabricae domum pro viceparochi habitatione, et nonnisi postquam notarius observasset legatum ita conceptum posse suppressioni civili esse obnoxium, consensisse ut in eumdem finem praebendae parochiali adiiceretur. Haec enarrant iurati tres ex testibus qui testamentii actui adfuerunt, qui praeterea affirmant eam fuisse parochi voluntatem eamque saepius manifestasse, nempe per emptam domum prospiciendi Fabricae ecclesiae necessitatibus adeo ut beneficio parochiali non reliquerit reapse domum nisi ad evadendum usurpationis fiscalis periculum. Hinc factum est ut ipse testator Fabricae ecclesiae, quippe legato honestatae, onus imposuit solvendi notarii honorarium, prouti revera praestitit.

E contra hodiernus parochus notat in primis non esse defuncti voluntatem aliunde eruendam quam ex testamenti legitimi verbis, cum vulgatum sit testamentum esse voluntatis nostrae supremam et solemnem significationem de eo quod post mortem nostram fieri velimus. Iamvero parochi Caroli testamentaria voluntas expressa fuit actu legitimo, apertis verbis nulli dubietati obnoxia. Dein advertit si ea parochi mens fuisset quam Fabrica asserit, pronum erat ut eamdem apud eosdem vel alios testes, manifestaret, et contestaretur quasi *ad fiduciam* aperiendam : quod tamen fecisse nullimode constat neque ipsa Fabrica contendit. Nihilominus parochus fatetur domui legatae onus inesse praestandi habitationem coadiutori, qui sibi imputare debet si hoc iure adhuc usus non est. Quum enim testator habitationis usum quoad certam partem domus reliquerit uxori fratris sui, viceparochus renuit cum legataria eamdem domum habitare. Sed non iure merito, notat parochus, nam uno tantum cubiculo mulieri a testatore assignato, novem supersunt cubicula a viceparocho libere inhabitanda, quibus proprius patet accessus, quo omnino seiunguntur a mulieris habitatione.

Praeter haec, controversia est inter partes num parochus pro tempore debeat dare inhabitandam viceparocho integram domum, vel illius tantum partem quae satis sit ad hoc, et reliquam vel aliis locare et fructus locationis libere percipere. Praeterea definiendum est cui onus insit manutentionis domus, solutionis taxarum, alia-

rumque expensarum, scilicet an Fabricae, vel parocho, seu potius viceparocho qui aedibus fruitur.

Hisce praemissis, sequentia observata sunt ex officio. Cum primis quaestio dicebatur non esse facti sed iuris, nam quoad facta partes non contendunt, sed in lis est an praevalere debeat voluntas per testamentum expressa, seu aliam quam testator tabulis consignare non ausit sed ipsis testibus testamentariis non semel aperuit.

Iamvero potius hanc postremam non testamento expressam sed aliter sufficienter manifestatam voluntatem sequendam esse non parvi momenti rationes suadent. Siquidem agitur de testamento ad causus pias. Atqui exploratissimi iuris est, quod in huiusmodi testamentis nulla requiritur civilis solemnitas ad validitatem, sed duo vel tres testes sufficiunt, attestantes de pia defuncti voluntate, ipsis manifestata aliquid *relinquendi ad causas pias*. Ita communiter Doctores interpretantes, *Relatum*, in Tit. "*De testamentis et ultimis volunt.*" Gury (1–818) testamenta ad causas pias sustineri etsi destituta quibuscumque solemnitatibus civilibus probat 1° quia constat ex Iure Canonico *Decret. Lib. 3 tit.* 26 *c.* 2 *etc.*, 2° quia piae causae ad Ecclesiam pertinent eiusque subiacent iurisdictioni; porro Ecclesia libera et immunis est a potestate civili in iis omnibus quae iurisdictioni suae directe subsunt. Quare a Concil. Trid. sic statutum est: *Episcopi etiam ut S, Ap. delegati, in casibus a iure concessis, omnium piarum dispositionum, tam in ultima voluntate quam inter vivos sint executores: Sess. 23, c. 8, de Ref.*—Ita S. Lig. —Ronc. et alii,—S. Poenitentiaria, pluries interrogata, huic sententiae adhaerendum esse respondit. Inter recentiores Canonistas Cl. Santi in comm. *ad Caput, Relatum*, dispositionem testatoris ad causas pias servandam esse ait, dummodo "de voluntate testatoris ultima, certitudine morali constiterit, sive per testes sive per scriptum sive alio modo."

Neque in casu obiici posset, causam quoque piam contineri in testamento per Notarium legitime rogatum, quare *privilegiatus adversus aeque privilegiatum suo privilégio uti non deberet;* namque advertatur sufficienter constare, veram testatoris ultimam voluntatem fuisse relinquendi domum non beneficio parochiali, sed Ecclesiae Fabricae. Quapropter quia in his causis veritas attenditur, testamento scripto testamentum nuncupatum, quippe vere privilegiatum, praevalebit.

Exinde Fabricae fructus iam percepti ex domo locata restituendi erunt, nisi forte juxta communes iuris regulas saltem in alia parte praescripti sint, et praeterea domus in Fabricae administrationem et possessionem constituenda erit sub ea tamen testatoris expressa lege "di servire *esclusivamente* per abitazione del Vice-Parroco."

Quocirca videtur non esse locum quaestioni, an legatae domus pars locari possit, vel potius an tota Coadiutoris habitationi destinanda sit: expressa enim et clara est testatoris voluntas.

Verum ex adversum Parochi intentioni videtur facere haec potissima ratio. Nimirum non hic agitur quodnam ex duobus testamentis praevalere debeat; nam unum tantum habetur testamentum; alterum omnino desideratur. Esset enim omnia undique vertere in materia testamentaria si testandi propositium cum ipso testamento seu suprema voluntate confundatur. Ut alios praeteream, concordes in hoc omnes Canonistas, referam verba Cl. Santi *l. c.* subsequentia his iam citatis in aliam partem; nempe: "Dixi de voluntate ultima, nam 1° non teneretur heres legitimus ad aliquid praestandum ad causas pias, si constaret solummodo de defuncti proposito seu de consilio vel desiderio condendi testamentum, aut relinquendi aliquid causae piae, sed *constare debet de voluntate absoluta et positiva.*" Atqui testes testamentarii in casu fidem faciunt de proposito defuncti domum legandi Ecclesiae fabricae, sed non minus aperte de mutato proposito deque rationibus ad hoc impulsivis testantur; quapropter tantummodo evincere videntur testatoris consilium vel desiderium non eam supremam voluntatem expressam ut post mortem fiat per executores quod in voluntate fuit testatoris. Quocirca testandi solemnis voluntas et actus examussim defuerunt.

Quamvis vero parochiali beneficio domus potius legata videatur, nihilominus non dubia est testatoris voluntas, nempe per eamdem comparando congruam Coadiutori habitationem, ita fabricam sublevando ab huiusmodi onere hactenus ipsi inhaerente. Hoc fatetur fabrica nec diffitetur parochus, imo aperte recognoscit, dolens praeterea quod hoc iure usus non sit Coadiutor, neque fabrica, cuius maxime intererat eumdem inducere ad habitationem sibi relictam suscipiendam. Unde parochus videtur deducere quod si damnum exinde fabrica persentit, non alii quam sibi imputare debere.

Forsitan maior quaestio est an expensas refectionis ordinarias et

onera vectigalium ferre debeat parochus an Coadiutor usuarius. Si stemus iuri Romanorum, ex *l.* 19 *ff.* "De usu et habitatione" huiusmodi onera et expensae sunt, pro rata parte, communia heredi et usuario quando usuarius tantummodo pro parte rei usum habet; secus omnia fert haec onera usuarius si re integra et solus utatur. Ita etiam *Cod. Ital. art.* 527 ita concepto: "Se chi ha l'uso di un fondo ne raccoglie tutti i frutti o se chi ha il diritto di abitazione occupa tutto la casa, soggiace alle spese di cultura, alle riparazioni ordinarie ed a pagamento dei tributi come l'usufruttuario.

"Se non raccoglie che una parte dei frutti o non occupa che una parte della casa contribuisce in proporzione di ciò che gode." Cfr. d'Annibale *II n. 167.*

Quamvis autem testator dicat domum debere "*servire esclusivamente* per abitazione del Vice-parroco," nihilo secius duplici interpretationi obnoxia est huiusmodi loquendi forma. Vel enim intelligitur integram domum, exclusis quibuscumque aliis, debere Coadiutoris habitioni inservire: vel potius intelligitur, legatam domum, aliis exclusis usibus, utpote ad publicas scholas, in perpetuum adhibendam esse in usum habitationis pro Vice-parocho. Haec vero secunda interpretatio magis conformis est subiectae materiae, quia nimis ampla est tota domus testamento relicta pro unius tantum Coadiutoris habitatione. Adde quod stante hoc dubio voluntatis testatoris, possidet lex positiva praescribens in *cit. art. Cod. Ital,* 524, praesumendum esse legatum fuisse ius habitationis pro ea tantum parte usuario necessaria. Concordat Ius Romanum in *l.* § 4, 5, 6. *ff. tit.* "*De usu et habitatione.*"

Quare deliberabunt EE. PP., an concedendo Parocho vel potius Vice-parocho fructus locationis percipiendos a certa parte domus locandae, eidem, cui commodum conceditur, onus imponatur ferendi vectigalia et refectionis expensas ordinarias; vel potius Vice-parocho adiucando exclusivum ius habitationis, ipse ferre debeat onera vectigalium et ordinarias refectionis expensas.

Hisce in utramque partem delibatis, quaestiones Vobis EE. PP. propositas enodandas, per sequentia submitto

DUBIA

I. *An beneficio parochiali vel potius Fabricae domus fuerit legata, in casu.*

Quatenus affirmative favore Fabricae,

II. *An Parochus fructus iam perceptos Fabricae restituere debeat in casu.*

Quatenus vero affirmative favore beneficii parochialis,

III. *An Parochus ita debeat Coadiutoris prospicere habitationi, ut ab hoc onere sublevet omnino Fabricam, in casu.*

IV. *An domus pars non necessaria Coadiutoris habitationi, possit locari, in casu.*

V. *Quinam ferre debeat vectigalia et refectionis ordinariae expensas, in casu.*

Et Sacra Congregatio omnibus mature perpensis, die 27 Aprilis 1895 respondit :

R. Ad I.um Affirmative ad I.am partem, Negative ad II.am.

Ad II.um Negative, ita tamen ut Fabrica reddatur indemnis de expensis quas sustinuit a die captae possessionis, ex parte parochi, domus legatae.

Ad III.um Affirmative.

Ad *IV.tum* et ad *V.um Ad mentem.*

EX S. ROMANAE ET UNIVERS. INQUISITIONIS

Instructio super adsistentia discipulorium catholicorum religiosis functionibus schismaticorum.

Non semel ad hanc S. Sedem relatum est in nonnullis imperii russiaci provinciis infeliciter accidere, ut publicorum gymnasiorum scholarumque discipuli catholici aliquoties per annum templa acatholicorum adire, unacum discipulis acatholicis sacris eorum functionibus interesse, atque ritibus acatholicis participare, crucem a ministro acatholico porrectam osculari, genu flectere, panes benedictos accipere aliasque ceremonias peragere adigantur. Ex qua re non solum ipsi adolescentes eorumque parentes in gravis salutis periculum coniiciuntur, sed etiam cappellani scholarum, praeceptores religionis, confessariique puerorum magnas in angustias atque discrimina incidunt. Quamobrem iterum iterumque a Sede Apostolica postulatum est, ut conscientiis fidelium subvenire atque circa rationem, qua sive scholares praedicti eorumque parentes sive confessarii atque magistri in difficillimis illis adiunctis se gerere debeant, opportunas regulas constituere ac praescribere velit. Cui postulationi debitoque custodiendae fidei satisfacere cupiens, S. C. Super. et Univ. Inquisitionis auctoritate Apostolica decrevit quae sequuntur :

1. Discipulorum praesentiam in expositis circumstantiis pro civili tantum ceremonia haberi non posse, sed continere vetitam omnino

communicationem in sacris acatholicorum, atque ideo prorsus illicitatem esse.

2. Magistros religionis in praedictis scholis teneri, si a discipulis eorumve parentibus interrogentur, eos monere, communicationem de qua agitur, tolerari non posse divinisque atque ecclesiasticis legibus contrariam esse.

3. Quod si interogati semel discipulos monuerint vel praedictae communicationi licet frustra obstiterint, non teneri protestationes iterare, nisi fundata adsit spes, iterationem utilem et efficacem fore, a qua etiam tum abstinere possunt, cum ex protestatione seu monitione iterata graviora mala timentur.

4. Quod si magistri religionis a discipulis non interrogentur, attentis gravissimis rerum circumstantiis, remoto scandalo, dissimulare posse, si pueri in bona fide sint. In qua tota re magistri praedicti iudicio Episcopi stare poterunt.

5. Confessarii ad quorum iudicium huius generis casus in tribunali poenitentiae deferri contigerit, tenentur pueros, qui licet non ignari graviter illicitam esse communicationem in sacris, de qua agitur, eam nihilominus imminentium malorum metu admiserint, similiter parentes qui alii culpae committendae auctores fuerint, diligenter instruere, corrigere et exhortari; nec eos absolvere poterunt, nisi serio promiserint, se in posterum a vetita communicatione in divinis sive praecipienda abstenturos esse.—Quod si tamen adolescentes vel parentes in bona fide sint, poterunt confessarii attentis gravissimis rerum circumstantiis, dissimulare, eos in hac bona fide relinquere, atque ab eisdem monendis abstinere.

6. Quod si alicubi mos sit, ut non omnes discipuli scholarum sacris acatholicorum intersint, sed pars tantum a ceteris electa omnium nomine adsistat, declarat haec S. Congregatio, hanc sive electionem sive interventionem illicitam esse, posse tamen, si pueri in bona fide sint, dissimulari, remoto scandalo.

Datum Romae ex S. Officio die 26 Aprilis 1894. Concordat cum originali.—J. Mancini S. R. et U. I. Not.

EX S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM

ORDINIS S. BENEDICTI

Dubia circa Oblatos saeculares S. Benedicti.

D. Godehardus M. Heigl. Ord. S. Benedicti, Abbas Affligeniensis et Visitator Provinciae Belgicae, S. Indulg. Congñi humiliter exponit:

In Congñi Cassinen., Primitivae Observantiae erectum esse Institum Saecularium cum quibusdam Statutis a S. C. EE. et RR. approbatis die 17 Ian. 1871, et Indulgentiis auctum per Decretum huius S. C. die 4 iunii 1888.

Nunc vero quum varia exorta sint dubia circa naturam horum Oblatorum, humilis Orator postulat ut sibi declarentur quae sequuntur.

I°. Suntne Oblati saeculares S. Benedicti considerandi sicut Tertiarii aliorum Ordinum?

II° Potestne Oblatis Saecularibus S. Benedicti impertiri benedictio cum Indulgentia Plenaria juxta formulam pro Tertiariis saecularibus approbatam a Summo Pontifice Leone XIII, die 7 Iulii 1822?

III°. Possuntne Oblati saeculares S. Benedicti fieri Tertiarii alterius Ordinis et viceversa?

IV°. Debentne Oblati saeculares S. Benedicti qui simul sunt Tertiarii ex: gr: S. Francisci, S. Dominici etc. eligere Ordinem ad quem pertinere velint?

S. Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita perpensis dubiis supra propositis, ex Consultoribus voto respondem censuit.

Ad I^{um} *Affirmative.*

Ad II^{um} *Negative*, absque speciali privilegio.

Ad III^{um} *Negative*, iuxta Decretum huius S. Congñis d. d. 31 Januarii 1893.

Ad IV^{um} *Affirmative*, ut in una Ord. Min. Cap. diei 21 Iunii 1893.

Datum Romae ex Secria ejusdem S. C. die Ianuarii 1895.

F. IGNATIUS, *Card.* PERSICO, *Praef.*
A., *Archiep.* NICOPOLIT, *Secret.*

EX S. POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

De executione dispensationis matrimonialis.[1]

EMINENTIA RMA.

Benedictus Maria della Camera Episcopus Auxiliarius et Vicarius Generalis dioec. Thelesin. seu Cerretan., Eminentiae Vestrae Rmae, prout sequitur submisse exponit:

1 Ex Analecta Eccl. an. 1895 p. 115.

Aliquando evenit quod in petitionibus quae ad S. Sedem pro matrimonialibus dispensationibus transmittuntur ab Ordinario Oratoris, fuerit expositum, ex errore, oratricem pertinere ad eamdem dioecesim, dum revera titulo originis et domicilii ad alteram pertinebat.

Hinc, obtento affirmativo Rescripto sive ex hac S. Poenitentiaria, sive ex S. Dataria, exortum est dubium circa validitatem vel liceitatem executionis Rescripti :

Ad quod tollendum, humiliter deprecatur Eminentiam Vestram Rmam, ut declarare dignetur :

1. Utrum, attentis normis a S. R. U. Inq. traditis die 20 februarii 1888 possit Ordinarius Oratoris qui testimoniales praebuit litteras, exequi *valide* dispensationem, quando ex errore, fuerit expressum in iisdem testimonialibus, Oratricem ad eamdem pertinere diocesim, dum titulo sive originis sive domicilii ad alteram pertineret ?

2. Posito quod *valide* possit talis dispensatio executioni mandari, utrum poterit, et *licite*, quin denuo ad S. Sedem sit recurrendum ?

Sacra Poenitentiaria ad premissa respondit :

Ad utrumque affirmative, sed si error animadversus fuerit corrigendus est.

Datum Romae ex S. Poenitentiaria diei 6 Februarii 1895.

F. N. AVERARDIUS S. P. *Reg.*
V. CAN. LUCHETTI S. P. *Secr.*

LITTERAE

S. CONGREGATIONIS DE PROPAG. FIDE

DE SCHOLIS PAROCHIALIBUS ET NEUTRIS.

Dno Cardinali Alexandro Taschereau Archiepiscopo Quebecensi.

EME. ET RME. DOMINE MI OSME.

Sacra haec Congregatio Fidei Propagandae compertum habet quam graves catholicis in Manitoba leges quaedam acciderint circa scholarum regimen ab illius Provinciae Gubernio recens conscitae. Quod quidem eo magis dolendum evenit, quod rerum conditioni in ea regione favore Catholicorum ex solemnibus pactionibus jampridem constabilitae refragetur, florentesque ibidem Catholicae scholae in discrimen adducantur. Merito proinde ad tam grave periculum

propulsandum, eorum catholicorum patrocinium penes Foederale Gubernium universi Canadenses Antistites nobilissimis datis literis susceperunt. Nec violatis catholicorum juribus atque espiscoporum conatui Foederalis Gubernii voluntas defuit vel auctoritas. Verum quominus res e sententia succederet, haud levia interjecta obstacula hactenus prohibuere. Nunc autem quum ex Regii Consilii Privati in Anglia data nuper sententia Foederale Gubernium ad hoc gravissimum negotium pertractandum certa auctoritate muniatur, spei locus est, ut res eo tandem evadat, quo firmissima jura, religionis bonum atque ipsius reipublicae emolumentum postulant. Capessenda tamen alacriter opportunitas, nec eorum Catholicorum tutela deserenda. Quapropter sacrum hoc Consilium, in re tanti momenti, cohibere vocem non potest, quin erecta jam in id catholicorum ac praesertim episcoporum Canadensium studia confirmet magisque accendat ; ac dum meritis honestat laudibus sedulam in hujusmodi causam jam collatam operam, simul animum addit, ut pro viribus inceptum nobilissimum prosequentes, ad felicem exitum perducere adnitantur.

Falso quippe quorundam mentibus ea opinio incessit, nihil periculi in scholis quas neutras vocant adesse, easque sine discrimine a catholicis pueris posse frequentari. Etenim, aliis omissis, eae quae neutrae scholae dicuntur, eo ipso quod ex ambitu suo exclusam una cum aliis veram etiam religionem faciant, gravem huic injuriam inferunt, quum ab illo principe loco deturbatur, quem quum in omni humanae vitae consuetudine, tum maxime in juventutis educatione habere debet. Nec fas est asserere privata parentum cura huic defectui posse sufficienter suppleri. Id scilicet remedium mali esse tantum ex parte poterit, sed educationis illius sine Deo in scholis traditae vitium pessimum non excusat. Cui et illud addatur, religionis dignitatem in puerorum existimatione imminui oportere, si illam veluti publico honore carentem intra domesticos parietes relegatam viderint. Quid vero si parentes desidia aut occupationibus impediti, remissius, ut fieri solet, agant, neque extra disciplinam a liberis in scholis habitam, eorum religiosam institutionem sive per se, sive per alios satis curent ?

Quamobrem nihil ferme ad fidem praeservandam in populis consultius fieri potest, hoc praesertim tempore quum eam tot errorum procella impetitam videamus, quam ope catholicarum scholarum religionem ac pietatem in teneris puerorum animis inserere, excolere, et munire, ita ut una cum litterarum rudimentis ac liberalioribus disciplinis christianae vitae instituta alte recipiant, firmaque

in reliquum vitae cursum retineant. In id operis qui studia viresque contulerit, is optime meritus de religione jure habeatur.

Porro firmissima haec principia, quibus Canadenses Episcopi tanta constantia jugiter institere, sacrum hoc Consilium nunc permovent ut noto ipsorum zelo vehementer commendet catholicorum provinciae Manitobae jurium circa religiosam liberorum educationem defensionem, ut haec, prouti spem facit justitia causae, vindicentur, ac gravis ab Ecclesia avertatur injuria.

Interim manus tuas humillime deosculor.

Eminentiae Tuae humillimus addictissimus servus

M., *Card.* LEDOCHOWSKI, *Praef.*
A., *Archiep.* LARISSEN, *Secret.*

BOOK REVIEW.

AGNOSTICISM AND RELIGION. An Examination of Spencer's Religion of the Unknowable, Preceded by a History of Agnosticism. Dissertation for the Doctorate in Theology written by the Rev. George J. Lucas of the Catholic University of America. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1895.

This volume gives ample evidence of patient, orderly, and successful research in the lines of investigation specially connected with the subject of Agnosticism, as well as in many difficult collateral branches whose data tend to elucidate the issues involved, and to confirm the truth of the author's conclusions. At the outset, the reader is placed in an advantageous position by a rapid, preliminary sketch of the course of human thought, outlined with especial reference to its bearings on the questions at issue; and the judiciously noted inter-relations of the various systems serve to prepare the mind for an intelligent consideration of the principal theme. Spencer has been justly selected as the only methodical exponent of Agnosticism, and a refutation of his teaching constitutes the second part of this interesting work. Mr. Spencer's "religion" is viewed both from the historical and metaphysical standpoint, and in each instance an overwhelming array of evidence is brought against the inane cult of the Unknown. We could have wished, however, for a somewhat more nervous and incisive treatment of Spencer's fundamental dictum that religion is mere theory. This dogma is ingeniously set forth; it is dangerous, all the more so because it is interesting; and yet it is here formally answered only by an appeal to authority. Of course, we know that it is many times implicitly refuted by the arguments of the second chapter, but the importance of the thesis would seem to demand a more direct and extended consideration of this particular view. For the rest, the work is replete with instructive information, and during its perusal we were impressed with the value it possesses for those students of philosophy who could appreciate a concise comparative

review of the positions held by the leading exponents past and present of human thought in this important phase of its development. We congratulate the author on this first fruit of his intellectual pursuits in defence of Catholic truth, which certainly reflects honor upon the writer and his Alma Mater.

LES AMITIÉS DE JÉSUS. Simple étude par M. J. Ollivier, O. P. Paris: P. Lethielleux. (A. Roger et F. Chernoviz.)

It is a study full of sweet delights and consolations to penetrate into what may be called the human qualities of our divine Master's sacred heart. Love springs from three sources; that of blood relationship, that of sympathy, wherein taste and temperament unite kindred souls, and that of association of interests and pursuits, such as attaches with special affection the master to his disciples, and these to one another. In our Lord's life, these three kinds of love are exemplified as distinct from that of divine charity which made Him lay down His life for all men. Our author depicts, in the first place, the affectionate relations existing between Jesus Christ and the members of the Holy family, Mary and Joseph, Zachary and Elizabeth, the holy Precursor and the other relatives who are sometimes called brothers of the Lord. He dwells on the love of country, and shows how far this sentiment, placed by God in the human heart, animated our Lord himself. The second part of the work describes that beautiful friendship which existed between the Saviour and those who dwelt in the house at Bethany, Lazarus and his sisters, where we find our Lord in familiar intercourse with Mary Magdalene.

The third part deals with what the author calls the friendships *de mission*, those ties of apostolic devotion which called forth professions of special attachment and love from St. Peter and the rest of the Apostles; which extended likewise to the disciples, the holy women, the first converts, and the Church as the Saviour's Spouse-elect forever.

P. Ollivier bases his sacred narrative, if we may give this name to a work no less historical than devotional, upon the accounts of the Evangelists, and after that upon those edifying traditions kept alive from the days of the early Church through the Fathers and sacred writers of succeeding generations. There is surely nothing unbecoming in this, when we reflect that the Gospels contain but

scanty delineations and references to many things which were done and said by our Lord, and which must have been treasured by those who were witnesses of His earthly life, as well as by their disciples. The author does not, as a popular romancer might be tempted to do, overstep the limits of authentic accounts, although these cannot claim the infallible sign-manual of the inspired writings. In a separate appendix he gives the various traditions regarding the relations of our Lord to those around Him, dwells on the iconography of the Holy Family, St. John and the apostles, saintly and analyses, with considerable critical skill, visions of persons regarding the life of our Blessed Lord. It seems difficult to us to pronounce on the exact value of such revelations, or to declare positively against them; since in the case of the holy nun Catharine Emmerich, there are undoubted evidences that she was preternaturally informed of facts which could not have reached her in the ordinary ways of human communication. Nevertheless, it is preferable that the critic be on the side of severity and incredulousness, rather than be inclined to admit as facts what has but imagination, however pious, for actual support. This is the position of our author, who gives us such pledges for the truth of his statements as are admitted by historians generally, when applied to the accounts of profane writers.

It is a most attractive and useful work as a study of the human side of our Lord's life.

RECORDS OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PHILADELPHIA. Published quarterly. Vol. VI. Nos. 2 and 3, 1895. Published by the Society. $2.00 per year. Single number, 50c.

Reprint from the RECORDS (March and June) of the "Diurnal" of Rt. Rev. John England, D.D., first Bishop of Charleston. Price, 50c.

It is surely a matter of congratulation for every lover of Catholic truth, to find a society of highly cultured men and women thoroughly in earnest in the work of collecting really solid material to serve the future historian of Catholicity in America. The American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia may be said to be representative in this respect; and for this reason its efficiency might be greatly increased in the interests of a common cause, if many of

the smaller or local associations pursuing a similar purpose could be got to amalgamate with this Society, which commands such superior forces and methods. One of these is the periodical publication of the "Records," an historical quarterly, the five or six volumes of which form a very important and thoroughly interesting set of annals and notes. The worth of these records must be recognized as growing with every succeeding year, when we remember how easily details of character and place are lost amid the multiplicity of present interests and the mania for changes and "improvements." A single line in the works of Tacitus, or an expression in the "Wars" of Josephus, has determined the judgment of posterity regarding important facts of history.

In the two numbers of the "Records" presently under review, we find the *Diary of Bishop England*, published for the first time from a manuscript which the Historical Society obtained by purchase from a well known collector. The importance of this journal, consisting of desultory notes of facts and rapid sketches of incidents and impressions during several years, can hardly be overestimated. It is far more valuable than would be the history of the same period written in the polished style of which Bishop England was capable when he chose. In the first place, the principal element required in historical writing, namely truth, is far more sure to be presented in such notes as these, than it would be where the writer is conscious that what he says will be judged with more or less of a common prejudice. A speaker is nearly always influenced by the character of his audience; our letters to friends are often and as much a picture of their mind and feelings as they are of ourselves. We "adapt" ourselves by an unconscious instinct, and vary even our views and tones according to the probability of finding a reflection or response in those whom we address. But a man, notably one of such undaunted temper, rapid power of assimilation, and mental analysis which did not permit him to veil from him his own weakness, is sure to give us the truest and best that he feels at the moment when he take down his impressions primarily for his own sate guidance. Apart from this, there is a singular vividness in these jottings down of incidents and resolves when they are fresh upon our minds; and they portray the man, his character and feelings, with that peculiarly incisive accuracy noted in the outline sketches of the great portrait masters. We get not only Bishop England's judgments and acts, but those feelings which he might have veiled from the public, as men who are not vain are apt to do.

We have, then, good reason to thank the Historical Society of Philadelphia for having caused a reprint of this interesting journal to be made and published in separate pamphlet form. As such, it makes a valuable supplement to the works of Bishop England, which, now long out of print, are treasured in many libraries of institutions and priests both as a faithful picture of actual facts and for their intrinsic literary value. Even those who do not possess Bishop England's complete works will find this "diary" of interest and use as throwing fresh light on other historical sketches of early missionary activity in the United States.

The *Diary of Bishop England* can be obtained from the headquarters of the Historical Society, 219–21 South Sixth street, Philadelphia, Pa.

INTRODUCTION TO THE S. SCRIPTURES. In two parts. By Rev. John MacDevitt, D.D.—Benziger Bros. 1895. Pr. $1.35.

A new edition of this volume was very desirable, as it was practically the only work on the Introduction to the Holy Scriptures which students in colleges and members of our Reading Circles found it possible to use with advantage. The author has carefully revised his matter so as to bring it in full harmony with the principles and rules laid down in the late Encyclical of our Sovereign Pontiff.

Messrs. Benziger Bros. have considerably reduced the price of the work, so as to facilitate its more general introduction among the laity.

FIFTY YEARS IN BROWN COUNTY CONVENT. By a Member of the Community. Cincinnati: McDonald & Co. 1895.

In his article on "Paedagogica" in *The Library of a Priest*, written for the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Father Hughes, S.J., speaking of biographical works which serve to portray the working of educational zeal at special epochs, says: "I am at a loss for a work on the Ursulines." This want was being supplied at the very time when the writer of "Paedagogica" was collecting the material for his article. In a handsome volume of about three hundred well printed pages, with numerous illustrations, a gifted member of the Ursuline community of St. Martin's, Ohio, intro-

duces us to St. Angela Merici and her life work. It was in the days of the great religious revolt which culminated in Protestantism, that God raised up a number of holy persons who, by their heroic virtues and personal influence purified the tainted atmosphere which worldly ambition and secular habits had introduced into the pale of the Church, and gave occasion for the so-called "reformation." Her little "Company" of twelve humble nuns, animated by that special virtue of self-sacrifice which, when communicated to pure souls, carries with it something of the divine omnipotence, soon made their influence felt throughout southern Europe. Convents multiplied with wondrous quickness in Italy and France, and ere a century had passed we find the members of the new Institute traversing the ocean and settling in Canada. From Quebec, we see these devoted missionaries of the "new womanhood" extending their activity into the States, and founding convents and schools in New Orleans, New York, Boston and Charleston, mostly by the aid of members obtained from France and Ireland where the Order had already taken deep root.

The community with which the work before us is especially concerned, was the sixth in the order of American foundations. The first move for the introduction of the house of the Order into Ohio had been made in 1838, by the late Archbishop Purcell, on occasion of a visit *ad limina*, when he passed through France. The actual steps for the accomplishment of the Bishop's designs were taken by Father Macheboeuf in 1845. The departure from France of the first band of eleven devoted nuns, among whom were some English ladies, is described in a specially interesting manner.

The beginning of the work, after their arrival in Brown county, where they found a large tract of land with abundant springs, beautiful groves and fine locations for buildings of convent and academy, were not devoid of great personal hardships. It is always so with religious foundations. The promise of large and fruitful results is invariably dependent on the state of mortification to which the seed becomes subject. But we do not propose to sketch here the history of St. Martin's community during its fifty years of useful and blessed activity.

If there were no other evidence of the work done for God and their neighbor by these devoted religious than the story of their trials, struggles and sacrifices here written, it would be subject for congratulation; and we all know that a large portion of the successes of religious life finds no records save in heaven, where they

receive their reward. There is, of course, a great deal in these pages which will interest exclusively the persons immediately connected with the institution as a local religious centre, or as a school for the education of the young. Nevertheless, the casual reader will see even in these items something that throws light upon the nature of the results accomplished by the pioneers of Catholic civilization in our western States.

INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHICAE QUAS ROMAE IN PONTIF. UNIVERS, GREGORIANA TRADIDERAT, P. Joan, Urraburu, S.J. Vol. III.—Cosmologia. Vallisoleti: A. Cuesta, 1892. pp. 1316.

There are, of course, few institutions where this magnificent series of tomes, of which this is the third part, can be utilized as text-books. How their author could have adapted them in his own classes to such a use is quite a marvel. Their vast proportions would seem to demand a curriculum at least twice as long as that usually allotted to philosophy in our colleges and universities. The peculiar utility of the work must appeal, on the whole, to professors and to advanced students; to such as have already completed an ordinary course of philosophy. To these it will be a veritable mine of information, presenting as it does such fullness of matter so exhaustively developed. This wealth of subject and thoroughness of treatment are if anything more conspicuous in the present volume than in the two preceding. The main plan is, of course, that of similar works. The world is first viewed as a whole, its essential attributes, notes, perfection and distinction from the Supreme Being, offering guiding principles for the subsequent speculation. The cosmos is next regarded in its philosophical causes—efficient, final and typal, the whence, the when, the why, the pattern, coming here under treatment. Then the laws of nature and the exceptions they admit of in miracles are discussed.

From the world in its entirety to its component matter the deduction is natural. The questions concerning organic bodies are relegated to Pyschology, inorganic matter is followed to its essence, the systems on this unending controversy which seems to the author untenable being ably answered and his own position solidly established on great fulness of fact and theory.

Then we have the large subjects of quantity with its cognates, place, motion, time, and of quality with its dynamic and static